

THE CATHOLIC MIND

VOL. XLI

OCTOBER, 1943

NO. 970

Pope Appeals for Peace

This text of the broadcast by Pope Pius XII on the Fourth Anniversary of the War, September 1, 1943, is based on a translation from the Italian by the British Ministry of Information

IT is four years since the terrible day which marked the beginning of the most formidable, destructive and devastating war of all time. Foreseeing this brutal disaster which was threatening the great human family, We addressed a few days before the outbreak of hostilities a warm appeal to the leaders and the people as well as a suppliant warning.

We said "nothing, nothing is lost by peace. Everything may be lost by war." Our voice reached their ears but did not enlighten their minds and did not go deep into their hearts. The spirit of violence gained the victory over the spirit of concord and understanding, a victory which was a defeat.

Today, on the threshold of the fifth year of war, even those who then reckoned on swift war operations and a speedy, victorious peace, looking around at what is surrounding them,

inside and outside the fatherland, see nothing but grief and contemplate nothing but ruins.

To many whose ears were deaf to Our words, the most grievous spectacle which today presents itself teaches how much reality for the future there was in Our warning and prophecy. Then Our words were inspired by impartial love for all peoples without exception and vigilant care for their well-being.

SEEKS BENEFIT OF ALL PEOPLES

The same love and care move Us now in this grave and anguished hour to utter words which are intended to benefit all and harm none, while we untiringly supplicate Almighty God to open the way to the hearts and decisions of those who hold in their hands the fate of afflicted humanity.

Through gigantic struggles the

exterior happenings of war approach us and converge toward their culminating point. Never was the exhortation of Scripture, "Receive instruction, you that judge the earth," (Ps. ii, 10) more invoked or urgent than in this hour in which tragic reality speaks to all. All peoples must now meditate within themselves with their eyes on ruins. Give them wisdom and encourage them, support them in their efforts. To discourage them would be disastrous blindness.

In every land the soul of the people shrinks from the cult of violence and, in the horrible spectacle of death and destruction, contemplates merited condemnation. In all nations aversion is growing against the brutality of the methods of total war, which goes beyond all just limits, all rules of divine and human right.

PLEADS FOR GENEROUS PEACE

More than ever the minds and hearts of peoples are tormented by doubt whether continuation of such a war can be in accordance with national interest, or reasonable and justifiable before Christian and human conscience. After so many torn-up treaties, so many ignored conventions, so many broken promises, so many contradictory changes in feeling and action, confidence between nations has dwindled and has fallen so low as to deprive every generous resolution of spirit and hardihood.

Therefore We turn to all those whose task it is to promote agreement

and harmony for peace, with a prayer which springs from Our most intimate and sorrowful heart, and say to them that real strength need have no fear of generosity. It has always the means of guaranteeing itself against any false interpretation of its readiness and will for pacification and against any other possible repercussions.

Do not smother or impede the desire of peoples for peace by actions which instead of encouraging confidence rather inflame hatreds anew and strengthen determination to resist.

Give all nations a justified hope of worthy peace which does not clash with their right to live and their sense of honor. Let it be clearly seen that there is a loyal accord between your principles and your decisions, between statements about a just peace and facts.

Only thus will it be possible to create a propitious atmosphere wherein peoples who are less favored than others by the trend of war at any given time may believe in the dawning and development of a new sense of justice and cooperation among nations and draw from this belief the natural consequences of greater confidence in the future, free from fear that the preservation of the integrity or the honor of their fatherland may be compromised.

Blessed be those who, with firm and unswerving determination, help to prepare the ground where a sense of veracity and of international justice may germinate and blossom, thrive and ripen.

Blessed be those—to whatever

group of belligerents they may belong—who with the same unswerving determination and with an eye to realities, cooperate so that the deadlock wherein the fatal balance of war and peace which is now kept in suspense may be overcome.

Blessed be those who keep themselves and their peoples free from the bonds of preconceived opinions, from an influx of uncontrolled passions, inordinate egoism and an unjustifiable thirst for power.

Blessed be those who harken to the supplicating voices of the mothers who gave birth to their children so that they might develop in faith and in generous actions, not so that they might kill and be killed; and those who lend an ear to the anguished invocations of families torn by compulsory separations; to the even more insistent cries of people who after so much suffering, so many privations and bereavements, ask for nothing better in life than peace, bread and work.

Blessed be those who realize that great work for a new and just order is not possible unless their eyes are lifted to God, keeper and ordainer of all human events, initial source, guardian and avenger of all justice and right.

But woe to those who in this terrible moment do not reach full awareness of their responsibility for the fate of the peoples, who feed hatred and conflicts among them, who build their power upon injustice, who oppress and

torment the unarmed and innocent. (Jeremias xxii, 13.) You will see that the wrath of God will be with them until the end. (I Thess. ii, 16.)

PRAYER FOR THE PEACEFUL

May it please the Divine Redeemer from whose lips came the words "Blessed be the peacemakers," to enlighten the powerful and leaders of peoples, inspire their thoughts, their feelings and their deliberations, make them spiritually and materially vigorous and firm against obstacles, mistrust and perils which obstruct the path toward preparation and settlement of a just and lasting peace.

May their wisdom, their moderation, their strength of mind and their deep sense of humanity throw a ray of comfort upon the tear and blood-drenched threshold of the fifth year of war and give the survivors of the immense conflict, bent under a load of sorrow, joyful hope that the year may not end under the sign and in the shadow of slaughter and destruction, but may be the beginning and dawn of a new life, of brotherly reconciliation and a thorough and peaceful reconstruction.

With such confidence, We impart upon Our beloved sons and daughters of the Catholic World, as upon all those who feel united to Us in love and in the work for peace, Our fatherly Apostolic Benediction.

Pseudo-Liberals and True Liberalism

LOUIS J. A. MERCIER

IN 1940, as his troops were marching into Paris, Hitler said that the fate of the world was being settled for the next thousand years. He was mistaken. The fate of the world for the next period of history will be settled the day when, under the Providence of God, American soldiers march into Berlin.

We need have no false modesty about it. We may well pay tribute to the bravery of the British people after Dunkirk, and to the resourcefulness of their army in Africa; we may well salute the Chinese people and the Russian people for their dogged resistance to the invaders of their homeland; but we have the right and even the duty to point out that the British people would have remained helpless, and the Chinese and Russian peoples ultimately unable to escape a stalemate, without the determination of the American people to utilize all their resources, all their ingenuity and all their manpower to insure a total victory over Nazism, as well as over Japanese imperialism.

Without the United States, civilization could not win the war, and without the United States, civilization will not be able to win the peace.

That is why we are facing on this Patriots' Day one of the most critical hours of our history. That is why, after marshaling all our material resources,

Address delivered at the Patriots' Day Dinner of the Knights of Columbus, Boston, Mass., April 19, 1943.

we must now marshal all the spiritual resources which that day represents.

At the end of the war, we shall enter into not only a new era, but into a new world, a shrunken world. You know the story of the major in New York who recently telephoned to a friend: "Let me see, today is Monday. I can't see you till Friday. Wednesday I have to be in Africa."

In this new post-war world, Americans, Europeans, Africans will literally be able to rub elbows in renewed weekly intercourse.

How, then, could we remain isolated? How after having insured the defeat of the enemies of the freedom of the world could we forsake the world? We could not do so even if we wanted to.

So, after our crusade of arms, inevitably must come our crusade of ideals, to help to organize the world on a sound basis of international justice.

Today, the masses of the world look to the United States of America, not merely because we are powerful, but because throughout the 19th century, the United States stood, in the

minds of all struggling peoples and of all persecuted minorities, as the land of personal freedom and of a greater social justice.

That is what the Statue of Liberty meant to every immigrant who entered New York harbor, as some of us know from personal experience.

And that is why we may be sure today that our genuine immigrants and sons of immigrants, no matter what may be the land of their origin, will yield to no one in their loyalty to the United States.

Let us grant that there was still much to criticize even in the 19th century and the early 20th century America. Even so, all must admit that throughout their history the United States did unflinchingly stand for the following three principles:

The people does not belong to the Government, but the Government belongs to the people;

No government has the right to vote any law against the inalienable rights which belong to all men, no matter what may be their race or color;

No people has the right to violate the inalienable rights of another people.

No one can deny that, historically, these principles are of the warp and woof of American thought, nor should it be hard to see that their recognition alone can put an end to totalitarianism and to every form of social and of international injustice.

That is why it should be evident

that there is before us an even greater task than the military defeat of Germany and of Japan.

There is before us the task of standing by our principles at the peace table, and of leading the postwar world to recognize the soundness of those principles, so that all nations may be willing to govern themselves by their free acceptance.

Here, I believe, is where we need to straighten out a distortion of the history of thought which is constantly plaguing us.

Before we can be able to stand by our principles and lead others to recognize their soundness and freely accept them, we must clearly understand ourselves where these principles come from, and whence the contrary principles do.

But here precisely has been foisted upon us the greatest possible hoax.

GOVERNMENT BELONGS TO THE PEOPLE

There was built up in the course of the 19th century a conception of history whereby the Christian centuries were pictured to us as centuries of darkness during which men were held in subjection by the Christian Church, so that the progress of mankind has been presented to us as the gradual emancipation from that tutelage, till we stood liberated and marching on toward a great and glorious future.

Nothing could be farther from the truth, and before we can stand up for the principles of a true liberalism, we shall have to recognize clearly the

full extent of the trick which pseudo-liberals have played and are continuing to play upon us.

Here then is what we should come to see clearly again. The American doctrine that the people do not belong to the government but that the government belongs to all the people, the doctrine that every citizen has rights which no government may violate, the doctrine that every people has a right to self-independence, do not come from ancient or recent philosophers. They come from the teaching of Christ, and their first formulation is to be found in the writings of the Christian philosophers who elaborated the social and political doctrine of Christianity: "Love your neighbor as yourself for the Love of God," and "Render unto Caesar what belongeth to Caesar and to God what belongeth to God."

That is what the men of 1776 understood.

And here is what we should thoroughly understand today. These Christian principles of a true liberalism, alone capable of insuring social peace and international justice, came to be denied toward the end of the 18th century and throughout the 19th, as the perspective of the history of thought was distorted for us.

What we got down the last 150 years was a gradual repudiation of Christianity, and of God as Creator of the universe, and a consequent denial of the inalienable rights of men.

This is what we all should tire-

lessly try to make clear, because only on the basis of its understanding can we hope to tackle the task before us. This is not merely a war of material, it is a war of ideas. After the victory on the battlefields, we shall have to win out in the councils of the world, and to do so we shall need to distinguish not only between totalitarianism and democracy, but between true and pseudo-democracies.

It is sometimes said that American democracy and French democracy have a common origin. There is some truth in that saying. It is certainly possible that Montesquieu helped to give us the precious principle of the separation of the legislative, executive and judicial powers essential to insure a free government, a distinction which, let us hope, we shall never consent to see obliterated.

Montesquieu, however, was followed by Rousseau, and there were two phases to the French Revolution. The first phase in 1789 was largely inspired by Montesquieu's writings and remained close to the American revolution, with Lafayette as one of its leaders, but the second phase in 1793 was inspired by the *Social Contract* of Rousseau, and this second phase drifted into a government by liquidation on the guillotine not only of the king but of the leaders of the first revolution and ended in such a totalitarianism that the government of Napoleon which followed was hailed as a liberation.

And here's the significant reason why:

Rousseau's doctrine of the social contract pictures men in the state of nature doing as they please till they find it to their advantage to surrender that right through a contract which binds them all to obey the laws of the state.

Well, here's the catch. This means that for Rousseau "the right to social order does not come from the nature of man, it is founded on a convention."

PSEUDO-LIBERAL DEMOCRACY

What's the consequence? Here it is in Rousseau's own words: "The total alienation of each associate with all his rights to the whole community."

The sovereign then is the State. Being composed of all the citizens, Rousseau held, it did not need to give guarantees to its subjects, and on the other hand, those who refused to obey the general will must be forced to do so by the State.

As to religion, even Rousseau recognized its need, but as Rousseau, like the Nazis, considered Christianity debilitating, he concluded, like them, that all the citizens must have the religion of the State, consisting merely of such tenets as would make the citizens more obedient to the State.

Here we already have the very essence of totalitarianism, masquerading as democracy. Here's the repudiation of all inalienable rights, and the assertion that the citizens must obey the

State in all things, and that religion itself must be a tool of the State. Here is pseudo-democracy.

This does not mean, however, that German or Russian totalitarianism wholly or even primarily are out of Rousseau, though they might be.

The reason is that there developed, since the end of the 18th century, throughout the 19th and into our own, a philosophical doctrine which was even more radically anti-Christian than Rousseau's. This doctrine is the doctrine of the German philosophers and particularly of Hegel.

Rousseau ignored God as the author of the social nature of man, but Hegel directly denied God as an eternal antecedent righteousness according to which men must shape their lives and civilizations.

For Hegel, God is an ever evolving being manifesting Himself in the constantly changing institutions of man, in the march of the nations.

Hegel even went so far to to say that the ruthlessly victorious nation stood for the highest manifestation of his evolving god, and that, before its might, other peoples had no rights.

The teachings of Rosenberg, the Nazi doctrinaire, can be directly traced back to Hegel, and so can the doctrine of atheistic Communism through Karl Marx, who was a disciple of Hegel.

What then was the upshot of the Rousseauistic pseudo-liberal democracy based on the theory of the social contract and of the Hegelian philosophy and its derivatives?

The upshot was an irresistible trend toward totalitarianism even in the democracies.

Released from allegiance to an antecedent Divine law, and from the recognition of the inalienable rights of men and nations, governments tended to violate those rights, while the principle of progress through ruthless struggle let loose in turn unethical capitalism, contradictory imperialism, class wars and racial wars.

We should have the courage to recognize it. Nazism is no doubt the ultimate product of the repudiation of God's order, but all the western nations have had a share in producing Nazism, insofar as they disowned God and Christianity in the course of the 19th century, and practised selfish policies in their pursuit of wealth and their lust for power.

And even now it is a question whether even the allied nations have sufficiently repudiated their recent past to be prepared to orient the world away from the philosophies and the practices which have brought about its downfall.

Even we still have in our midst materialistic and atheistic leaders. They still tell us, as the Nazis do, that history develops solely under the pressure of biological and economic necessities, that we are living in a universe of constant and total change, that there is no moral law above men and nations, that what was held to be moral yesterday need not be held moral today or tomorrow, and that we can legislate

against the Ten Commandments, because there is no God, and man is the end of man.

We still have belated standpatters who dream of the days when free enterprise meant free exploitation of the workers, and free pursuit of limitless power.

And, on the other hand, we have an increasing number of pseudo-democrats in the Rousseauistic tradition who tell us that education divorced from religion must be wholly organized in terms of a changing social scene, and who carry on a tireless propaganda to din into the ears of our people that every measure that would put them under the tutelage of the State, even in times of peace, is the height of liberalism.

We cannot be said as yet to see clearly that the solution of the problem of social and international injustice is neither in the denial of its existence, nor in entrusting to the State or to a supergovernment the task of forcing citizens or nations to be moral by denying them their legitimate freedoms.

In short, it would be clearer that we are prepared to rid the world of rightist and leftist totalitarianisms, if it were less evident that we are still tainted by the philosophies which produced them.

Here, gentlemen, is the importance of the event we are celebrating this evening. It takes us back to the days of the Founding Fathers of this nation, and there we find ourselves in

an atmosphere above the miasmas of our time.

What a relief, after reading Rousseau, or Hegel, or our philosophers of relativism, and all our pseudo-liberals, to go back to the writings of Washington, and Adams, and Jefferson, and Madison.

Hegel speaks of an impersonal evolving god, and his remote disciples still tell us that we are helpless in the grip of cosmic forces, but George Washington "prayed to the Supreme Ruler of Nations to spread His holy protection over these United States . . . to verify the anticipation of this government being a safeguard to human rights."

Rousseau held that the State should not give guarantees to its subjects, and that all must be forced to obey the general will.

But Thomas Jefferson tells us "that a bill of rights is what the people are entitled to against every government on earth, and what no just government shall refuse or rest on inference."

Again Rousseau asserts that "all the citizens must have the religion of the State consisting only of such tenets as will make the citizens more obedient to the State." And Hitler repeats that today.

But James Madison tells us that "government must avoid the slightest interference with the right of conscience, or the function of religion so wisely exempted from civil jurisdiction."

Hegel and his modern disciples proclaim that ruthless and victorious war stamps a nation as the highest representative of progress.

But Samuel Adams tells us that "Congress should study what measures may be taken, in common with European nations, that national differences may be settled without the necessity of war, in which the world has too long been deluged . . . to the disgrace of human reason and government."

And above all these priceless principles of the American tradition stands the basic statement of the Declaration of Independence from which they may all be said to flow: "All men are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights."

CHRISTIAN AND RATIONAL SOCIOLOGY

This, thank God, is the American doctrine, but we should fully understand that it is more than an American doctrine. Jefferson himself tells us in substance that into the principles of the Declaration of Independence went the best thought of antiquity and of the Puritan resistance to the absolutism of James I; and today we know that the Puritans borrowed from the Catholic theologians who had worked out the social and political implications of Christianity.

Traditional American political thought is forever saving because it is grounded on the findings of reason confirmed and illumined by the Christian message, transcending all local opinions.

The saving principles of this Christian and rational sociology are perfectly simple, logical and clear.

Here is the doctrine of St. Thomas on property: "Temporal goods are subject to man that he may use them according to his needs and the needs of his neighbor and not that he may place his end in them."

And here is the doctrine of St. Thomas on the legislative power: "The laws of men are just and legitimate only in so far as they partake of the eternal laws . . . and the end of all law-making must be the public good."

Finally, here is in St. Thomas the principle of the sovereignty of the people: "The right to decree anything for the public good belongs only to the multitude or to those who represent it."

Have we any proof that this philosophical Christian thought was present in the minds of the founders of this nation?

We certainly have. One striking proof is that the *Summa* of St. Thomas was among the books donated by John Harvard to Harvard College.

Puritan writers against James I, we also know, constantly quoted from scholastic authorities, and from their contemporary, Cardinal, now St. Robert Bellarmine, who himself wrote against James I; and thus it was, in particular, that the principle of the sovereignty of the people, out of St. Thomas, came before the eyes of Thomas Jefferson. In the Congressional Library is Jefferson's copy of Filmer's *Patriarcha*, and

in Filmer's *Patriarcha* appear the words of Bellarmine: "Secular and civil power is immediately in the whole multitude, for this power is the divine law, but the divine law hath given it to no particular man. Power is given by the multitude to one man or to more by the same law of nature; for the commonwealth cannot exercise this power, therefore it is bound to bestow it upon some one man or some few."

Here then is the proof that the American political and social tradition is grounded not only on rational ethics but on Christian thought.

This Christian thought can be summed up in a few paragraphs:

There are eternal physical laws flowing from the physical nature of things, and so likewise there are moral laws flowing from the spiritual nature of man.

If men violate the physical laws, they will suffer. Inevitably too, then, if they violate the moral laws, they must suffer.

These moral laws are the obvious relations which men should have toward God because He is their origin, and toward one another, because God endowed them with a common nature. Men must recognize God as their only final end, and worldly goods as only their temporal end. They must recognize that natural resources belong to all men and should not be cornered by the few. They have a right to private property to safeguard their dignity and independence, to a family sustaining wage, to more abundant wealth if their

talents can justly achieve it, but this more abundant wealth they must not use merely for themselves but as a social trust. In general, the moral law is expressed in the Ten Commandments and is summed up in the principle: "Love God above all things and love your neighbor as yourself for the love of God."

Sovereignty belongs to the people, but they can delegate it to one or many as the circumstances warrant. The ruler or legislator, however, has the right to legislate only for the public good, according to the eternal moral law, and hence he must respect all natural rights.

Mankind naturally breaks up into different races and national groups, but all have the same inalienable rights and must act toward one another accordingly.

It is all very simple. Apply those principles and you will have a just distribution of natural resources, a just distribution of wealth, a just treatment of weaker peoples, and just governments abstaining from arbitrary rulings against the moral law. And having justice, social and international, you shall have peace, and only thus can you have peace.

It is all very simple in principle, but as we know it is not easy to carry out in practice, and here enters the special function which the Christian Church has always considered its special province, namely, to call the attention of men and nations to their need

of the grace of God if they would live consistently according to the moral law.

This need of a religious life has also been constantly stressed in the American tradition, and the whole point of view has perhaps never been better expressed than by President Roosevelt when he said in a message to Congress: "The defense of democracy, of international good faith and of religion is all the same fight; to save one, we must make up our minds to save all."

REORGANIZING THE WORLD

And so today, with many shortcomings, and many forces working in our midst against this Christian American tradition, but with that tradition intimately woven into our political fabric, we stand facing the great task of the reorganization of the world on the morrow of our victory.

In the shrunken world in which we shall then find ourselves, several great powers of yesterday will have become geographically and economically inferior. In fact, only China, Russia and the Americas will be big enough territorially to be capable of remaining by themselves independent powers.

Without alliance with one of these three, empires based on islands will not be able to survive, and the whole continent of Europe itself will remain at the mercy of a determined Asiatic power, unless we stand ready to intervene.

Before this new global geography

of the 20th century, how precarious must appear the rights of small nations to independence, and, after a war fought in the name of freedom, how ill-founded the claims of empire.

It should be clear, therefore, that there is no way of escaping our destiny.

Were we to isolate ourselves anew, the vast units, remaining standing at the close of the war, would pursue their evolution without us, and eventually against us.

This then is our great hour, the culmination of the mission which evidently became ours when the patriots of 1776 struck out in the name of the three principles we found to be the core of our political creed:

The people does not belong to the government, but the government belongs to the people;

No government has any right to vote any law against the inalienable rights which belong to all men, no matter what may be their race or color;

No people has the right to violate the inalienable rights of another people.

On these principles which sum up the Christian ethics of government and international relations, we must take our stand at the coming peace conference, as firmly as the Minute Men took their stand at the bridge of Concord.

With the prestige of our contribution to the final victory, with the confidence the submerged peoples of the world have always had in us, with the determination we shall have gained that never again should we have to

sacrifice the blood of our sons, we should be able to get all our allies, and even eventually our present foes, to recognize that in this new shrunken world of ours, we must find ways, no matter how great the difficulty, to insure justice to all classes and to all peoples; since justice to all, and international cooperation by mutual consent, are the only possible means of insuring permanent peace.

Nor are signs wanting that we may succeed, that, under the Providence of God, our blood and our tears may have won for us the grace of a greater enlightenment, that once we have paid for our sins of the past, we may hope for a more Christian behavior, by all, in social and international relations.

Indeed, already, we may well salute the awakening of our ally England to a greater preoccupation for social and international justice and for Christian fellowship as evidenced in the recent pronouncement of the Prime Minister.

We must salute, too, and with unbounded admiration, the patience, under unsurpassed sufferings even in this era of agonies, of the Chinese people, and of the glowing faith of their leaders in the Christian hope for all the peoples of the earth, as expressed here so recently and movingly by Mme. Chiang Kai-shek.

Following her example, we may well assure the nations with which we are at war that if justice now demands the punishment of their leaders, justice

also will demand that their people be readmitted to the fellowship of nations, once they have proved that they can be trusted.

We must also give a thought to the victims of this war. Gentlemen, I give you France, France our friend of the first hour, France which, after the last war in which she had sacrificed so much, was denied the protection she called for against a foe which she knew would rise again; France whose people are now suffering and bewildered, but whom we can trust to recover their Christian tradition, and, in a better democracy, gladden again the world by the productions of her many-sided genius.

Finally, we must mention the Russian people who, for so many centuries, were denied social justice. Far from me to countenance the means by which that injustice was ended, or the ideology that sought to wean them from religion by the promise of economic betterment.

But, before the heroism which they have shown, considering the greater social experience their leaders have gained in the last twenty years, considering too the more numerous contacts which those leaders are bound to have with our own Christian statesmen, it should be permissible to express the hope that even the leaders of Communism will come to recognize the superiority of a genuine democracy, respectful of the inalienable rights of

its own people, and of the rights of neighboring nations and the world community.

So, gentlemen, in spite of the uncertainties of the hour, and of the great sacrifices still ahead of us at this celebration of Patriots' Day, I believe that we may look to the future with confidence in proportion as we shall steep ourselves more deeply in the tradition of that day, in the principles of the Christian progressive democracy, for which it stands.

And I believe that, on this day, we Catholics have a right to be specially proud. For the principles of a Christian progressive democracy, as we have seen, were first fully formulated by our Catholic philosophers, and it is their political thought which we find at the very roots of American polity; while the full program for the exploitation of those principles can be found nowhere better expressed than in the Encyclicals of our great modern Popes from Leo XIII to Pius XII.

Let no one, as some do these days, accuse Catholics of favoring Fascism. A Catholic as such can no more be a Fascist than he can be a Communist, because the Fascist, like the Communist, considers the citizen and the Church only as tools of the State, and the very basic social principle of Catholicism is the assertion of the inalienable rights of the Church, and of the inalienable rights of every human being whatever his race or color.

And you, Knights of Columbus, with your splendid record of service

to God and country, know that particularly well.

You understand the difference between pseudo-liberalism and true liberalism, and you stand for that distinction:

Pseudo-liberalism liberates us from God's laws, but it inevitably makes us the slaves of the arbitrary laws of men.

True liberalism liberates us from

the arbitrary laws of men, through the recognition of the eternal laws of God.

You stand ready to denounce pseudo-liberalism and the pseudo-democracy which springs from it, wherever and whenever they may rise to deceive us; but, because of that stand, you the more surely know that, in this war, as in all past wars, Catholics are ready to die gladly, as many have already died, that genuine democracy may live.



Racial Harmony

You know that God made the flowers.

In fact He made everything. "So the heavens and the earth were finished, and all the furniture of them. And God saw all the things that He had made, and they were very good."—Genesis.

But the flowers—some of them He made white, some a beautiful red, some a gorgeous yellow. Others He made brown. Still others black. And we see gardens after gardens of these varicolored flowers, unmatched in their glorious splendor, which God has made. The gardener has been only His helper. They all stand together in beautiful harmony. Had their Creator made them all the same in height and size and color, they would become monotonous, tiresome and uninteresting.

So it was also that the same God introduced variety of color into the nationalities and races. Unending variety in height and size and color. And all for His own good purpose. Some are red, some black, others brown, yellow, or white. And it is all God's work, not man's.

Does it become anyone, then, to criticise the handiwork of His Creator? Does it become anyone to become poisoned by racial discrimination or hatred? To become so poisoned would not be criticizing the creature but the Creator. It would not so much be finding fault with our fellow-man as finding fault with God.

—MIDWESTERN POST, Indianapolis, Ind., August 20, 1943.

T
wor
four
thin
agan
ful
a fa
ciall
part
lutic
pelle
plen
tion
kind
are
her
mit
thes
you
reall

Rev
end
to re
the
miss

lan
The
after
Islam
to th
days

Spanish Friars in the Philippines

RAYMOND KUNKEL, S.V.D.

*Reprinted from The CHRISTIAN FAMILY and Our MISSIONS**

THERE is a good deal already known about the friars and their work in the Philippines during the last four centuries. However, not everything is clear enough. Protestant propaganda—and you know how successful that can be—has given most of us a false notion of the friars and especially of their mission work and the part they played in the Spanish Revolution of 1896 in which they were expelled from the Islands. There are plenty of books written on this question, but they are generally of two kinds: those written by authors who are either apologists of the Church or her most bigoted detractors. I'll admit that after ten months of study on these questions I am unable to give you both sides of the question as they really should be treated.

Before we consider the Filipino Revolution for independence at the end of the last century, we are going to review a bit of the mission work of the friars, as these Spanish religious missionaries were called.

Every schoolboy knows that Magellan discovered the Philippine Islands. The fact that King Philip of Spain afterwards sent expeditions to the Islands for the colonization was due to the mission spirit so active in those days. The first expedition to succeed in

establishing a Spanish colony was led by Captain Legazpi in 1556 with a few hundred soldiers and a band of Augustinian friars. Cebu was the site of the first permanent establishment, and from there priests and soldiers spread throughout most of the Islands subjecting the natives to the sovereignty of Spain. In seven years almost all the 400 inhabited islands were added to the crown of Spain.

Since the chief aim of the Spanish Government was to convert the natives to Christianity, the work of conversion and colonization went hand in hand. More missionaries came from Spain: Dominicans, Franciscans, Jesuits and Augustinian Recollects. The work of evangelization went on rapidly. So successful were these early missionaries that in twenty-one years the one hundred-and-forty friars had converted 250,000 Filipinos, which comprised one-half of the entire population at the time. Here are some figures to show their rate of progress. In 1860 there were 4,000,000, and in 1900 (when the friars were driven out) there were 6,500,000. Today there are 13,000,000 Catholics out of a population of 16,000,000. It is estimated that altogether 12,000 missionaries have preached Catholicism in the Philippines up to the present time.

* St. Mary's Mission House, Techny, Ill., April, 1943.

Now how are we to account for such a rapid spread of the Catholic Faith as these figures show? This can be ascribed to two factors: one was the character of the population when the Europeans first arrived. The Filipinos were in a fairly primitive state of culture with forms of religion of the type which readily give place to "higher faiths." Of the great religious systems of the mainland of Asia, only Mohammedanism had made much impression, and it had only begun to gain a foothold.

The other factor making for the adoption of Christianity was the nature of the contacts with the Western World. For Catholic Spain the primary aim of colonization in the Islands was the conversion of the natives, commerce was secondary. The friars were the real conquerors for Spain, and it is these brave missionaries who deserve the honor of civilizing the Filipino and changing a pagan oriental culture into a Christian occidental one. The mission methods of the friars were much the same as those used by our own modern missionaries. These apostles took up their abodes among the natives, mastered their languages, accommodated themselves to their modes of life, taught them to build houses and live in civilized society; they defended them against the oppression from greedy Spaniards; educated the children in schools; published books in the native dialects, and finally established even colleges and universities for the people whom they had rescued

from paganism and ignorance. During three hundred-and-fifty years the friars carried on one of the greatest conversion movements in history, and from it emerged a proud boast of the Church, the Catholic Philippines, the only Christian nation in the Orient. From 1572 to about 1860 the Philippines furnish some of the most glorious pages of the history of the Universal Church; after 1860 they furnish some of the saddest.

CAUSE OF REVOLUTION

What could have brought about such a vast change that nearly destroyed the work of the past centuries? I would say that the cause of the revolution of the Islands against Spain came from without, and the situation of the Spanish colonial system was one circumstance which made it possible. Strange as it may seem, it was Spaniards themselves who plotted this treacherous plan. Since the anti-clericals failed in their attempt to overthrow the Catholic monarch of Spain (about the middle of the last century) they transferred their plottings to the Philippines—Spain's most successful colony.

The acknowledged aim of these fifth columnists in the Islands was to overthrow the government of Spain in the Philippines. That would not be very difficult since there was always a very small army of Spanish soldiers, and that for the simple reason that a larger one was not needed. The friars, not the soldiers, were the protectors

and rulers of the Filipinos. Paternalistic as was the form of government, it was the best of any colony of the age. Because of the scarcity of Spaniards in the Islands, the friars were frequently the sole representatives of Spain among the people, being the mayor, judge, school superintendent and pastor in the villages. The revolutionaries realized that to drive out the Spanish Government they would first have to get rid of the friars.

Never in all the world had there arisen such calumnies as those made against the good friends of the Filipinos. They were accused of everything from downright treason against the natives to the basest immoralities. Those lies even spread to our own country and are still believed by many today, Catholics included. Freemasonry, since it was always a very strong force for revolution, was spread throughout the Islands. The Filipinos had great respect for educated men, since the friars had not taught them to think for themselves but to be always dependent on their padres. The simple Filipino was as plastic clay in the hands of these unscrupulous revolutionaries from Europe. Through the press, street-corner orators and political intriguers, the spirit of reform and then revolt was spread. Every attempt of the friars to squelch such "liberalistic" movements which were disloyal to God and country was used as evidence of Spanish suppression. Every fault of the corrupt Government of officials was blamed on the friars.

Secret societies among the masses modeled on Freemasonry were established to light the torch of revolt at the suitable time. Radical revolutionary violence was left for the Katipunan, popularly known as the KKK. It was a secret society among the masses, and the members secretly signed an oath in their blood to kill every Spaniard in the Islands, friars included.

The revolution broke out in Cavite Province and extended to the neighboring province of Luzon. What were 10,000 Spaniards against 11,000,000 Filipinos! Almost all the Spaniards that were captured were put to death without pity. It is estimated that sixty friars were killed, and about 300 taken prisoners; all the others had to flee to Manila. The leaders of the revolution treated with scarcely less consideration such of their own countrymen as refused to join the revolution, ill-treating them and destroying their possessions. Churches were torn down or completely wrecked and left in a heap of ruins. Reports are that 30,000 Filipinos lost their lives in this revolution. How many Spaniards, no one knows.

Then came the Spanish-American War; the American people were aroused to the fight when the battleship Maine was sunk in the harbor of Havana, Cuba. Admiral Dewey of the Pacific fleet received orders from President McKinley to find the Spanish fleet and to destroy it. Under cover of night the American squadron sailed quietly past the fortified Island of Cor-

regidor into the Bay of Manila. At daybreak Dewey opened fire upon the Spanish fleet in hiding there, and in less than four hours destroyed by shell-fire the fleet of twelve ships without the loss of a single man of the American fleet. The Americans landed at Manila and were soon reenforced with soldiers from the United States to drive Spain from the Islands. In this they were helped by the revolutionaries among the Filipinos.

The Filipino leaders were disappointed in American generosity. They expected the Americans to withdraw and give them independence as soon as the Spaniards were driven out. In 1898 Spain signed a peace treaty by which she ceded the Philippines to the United States. This was a deathblow to the Filipinos' aspirations for independence. Seeing their hopes frustrated and all their fighting useless (how did they know that the United States would be better governors than the Spanish?) they attacked the American forces on February 4, 1899. America's superior numbers, modern arms and tactics and a fully equipped navy were hardly an easy opponent for a small nation.

After two years of guerilla warfare practically all opposition ceased, and the Filipinos submitted to the United States. But when the Filipinos

realized that the Americans intended to put the larger part of the government in the hands of native officials, forced submission transformed itself into a most enthusiastic cooperation.

RECONSTRUCTING THE CHURCH

Now what about the Church during and after the revolution. Very many of the churches and priests' homes were destroyed during the revolution. The personnel of the early Filipino government was in nearly all cases those most active during the revolution: masons and anti-clericals. The first concern of these leaders was to see that all traces of the Spanish domination be removed at once, and so during the next five years, from 1900 on, about 1000 Spanish friars were expelled from the islands of their missionary labors. Pope Leo XIII in 1902 promulgated the general outline for the reconstruction of the Philippine Church. The Holy See appointed American and foreign bishops to succeed the Spanish bishops, thus meeting the wishes of both the American government and the Filipinos. The monasterial property of the friars was purchased by the government for \$7,000,000. And thus the glorious link of the Church in the Philippines with the Spanish friars was broken after three-and-a-half centuries.



What the country needs is dirtier fingernails and cleaner minds—*Will Rogers*.

Searchlight On Islam

AODH DE BLACAM

Reprint from THE IRISH MONTHLY*

SOME events make news; some make history. News seldom is more than a nine-days' wonder, but a thing that is not thought worth mentioning at the time moves the world. When a young knight from Loyola was wounded at a siege, who guessed that the Company of Jesus, and all that an immense Order still is doing among the nations, would come of that single casualty?

A few days ago, the radio news told us, in a casual sentence, that the King of Egypt and the Government of Iraq had exchanged messages favoring a federation of Arab States . . . and then the bulletin proceeded with more exciting tidings of towns afire and ships sinking. The sentence, perhaps, was a straw in a wind as great as the storm of war.

It was a signal that a tremendous project has gone one stage further towards accomplishment—the reunion, firstly, of the Arab peoples, and then of the larger Muhammadan world, resulting in the restoration of Islam as one among the Powers of the world.

Towards this, Islam has been moving throughout the present century. It is a matter of tremendous import. In 1937, after the pan-Arabian congress, the *Osservatore Romano* exhorted writers to give the uprise of Islam "vigilant attention." Yet there

is, in these islands, but one writer, Mr. Hilaire Belloc, who has pointed to the signs and interpreted them. So little interest is taken by most people, that Mr. Belloc's chapters on this theme have attracted small attention; and a mighty revolution is stealing upon the world all but unheralded.

We speak of public indifference; but Governments and scholars are not unaware of what is afoot. Ever since the international struggle began, the belligerent Powers have been broadcasting their rival claims in Arabic and other tongues used by Moslems, each side exerting its resources of persuasion to the utmost, in hope to win the ear of the Moslem world—to gain the adherence of the wakening giant.

Radio, in the event, has proved one of the main factors in the pan-Islamic movement. It has drawn together the many races and peoples who share one faith, as never they were drawn since the olden days of Islam's *jibads* or holy wars. When the King of Egypt died, the funeral ceremonies were broadcast; Moslems in Jerusalem, in Morocco, in Iran and Iraq—nay, but in the desert oases; for the dwellers in moving tents now carry their listening sets with them—joined in the chanted lamentations and the prayers. Radio has thus summoned all Islam

* 5 Great Denmark St., Dublin, C.16, July, 1943.

to united thought and feeling, and perhaps united action, like some muezzin crying from a tower in a voice that reaches all the world.

While Governments plead and diplomatically toil for the friendship of the neo-Islam, learned men begin to write of Muhammadanism and the Islamic world, giving us books of varied interest and value.

EXTENT OF ISLAM

In order to realize the extent of the Islamic world, take a map of the Eastern hemisphere, and a brush filled with green ink—the Islamic color. Paint all Africa north of Latitude 10° N green, and carry the brush down the populous East coast. Color all the Middle-East green — Arabia, Syria, Iraq, Irán, and extend the wash to Malta and Albania in Europe, and out over the Soviet lands East and North of the Caspian. Color on, over Turkistan and the Khirgiz country and lands north of Tibet. Color Afghanistan and large areas in India, especially the densely-populated North and the Ganges. You will need ink, too, for a chain of islands in the East Indies, the lands rich in tin and rubber, prizes now contested.

There is your map of Islam, a vast spiritual continent, ten thousand miles by ten, flung across the center of the earth, with our torn European Christendom to the north of it, and the heathen lands to the South and East, in which Christian missions are rivalled by the spreading power of the Prophet.

The people of these Muhammadan countries, which you have marked in green, number considerably over 200,000,000 souls.

Some of the Islamic peoples are free, some are subject. Some are among the oldest nations of the earth—Egypt, Irán, Iraq—and some are primitive. Some dwell in cities with a civilization of European standards; some are nomads of the desert. Most of them are moved by the renaissance. The Middle-East broke free from Turkish domination twenty-five years ago; ancient lands became new nations. Let the stir among them become a general, unified Islamic revival, and two-hundred million people, living contiguously, will be as big a power as the United States of America, or the Soviet Union.

That is the actual aspiration of many, especially among the highly-educated Egyptians; and some Moslems dream of recovering, within an Islamic Union, even the lost land of Spain, where the Caliphate of Córdoba once raised Islam to its highest achievements in letters, law and philosophy.

What is this religion of Islam, lying beyond Christendom like its shadow?

Mr. Belloc, who has written so excellently on the subject, stresses the truth that Islam is not a distinct and alien religion like Buddhism, so much as heresy. The dignified but despairing religion of Buddha rose as a native growth from Indian soil. Islam, on the other hand, but for Judaism and Christianity, would not exist at all.

Two hundred years after St. Patrick brought Ireland into Christendom, the man Muhammad¹ dwelt in the idolatrous city of Mecca, in Arabia. Now Muhammad was one of those dynamic persons who cannot endure the slovenly ways of common men, but must impose their driving will upon their fellows. He had known Jews and Christians, and he recognized that their worship of God raised them above his stone-worshipping neighbors. Accepting the Jewish Scriptures and prophets, he wrote his own turbulent scripture, the Koran. "In this book there is no doubt," he began. To the Jewish record he added the names of Our Lord and His Blessed Mother, but he denied to the Incarnate Son of God a higher title than that of the best of human prophets before himself.

Such was the fanatical self-confidence of this Meccan citizen, that he claimed superiority even over the Redeemer. He preached, indeed, that God Almighty is the creator and ruler of the universe. He taught that God, whom he called Allah, is just, merciful and compassionate; that the souls of men are immortal, and will be judged of God. He dismissed the idols, fetiches and local deities worshipped by the Arabians before his time, though he was content to accept the Kaaba, the idol-stone of Mecca, as a meeting place for the pilgrims of Allah. Together with the divinity of Christ, he denied the doctrines of the Blessed Trinity, the Incarnation and the Mys-

tical Body, as well as, of course, the authority of the Church and the Sacraments.

Himself polygamous, this self-proclaimed Prophet taught no high standard of morality; he imposed many fanatical prohibitions, like that of representational art — no true Moslem might paint pictures, and art perished lest there should be image worship. He formulated a detailed, drastic discipline, which extended to all phases of the believer's daily life. His followers, drilled in this simplified creed and code — this distortion of Christianity; this heretical fragment of the truth — went forth with impassioned zeal to subdue the earth to Allah and his Prophet.

The swift spread of Islam, its conquest of decadent or troubled parts of Christendom — Egypt, the Holy Land, Syria — its rush along the southern shore of the Mediterranean, its invasion and almost complete conquest of Christian Spain, its thrust into France, when it was at last turned back in a battle that decided (as Gibbon said) that the Koran would not be taught in the schools and Muhammad preached from the pulpits of Oxford — this is an amazing, oft-told tale.

The expansive power of Islam did not end in that first terrific explosion. It pressed on; it was met in the Crusades and hardly checked; it captured Constantinople in 1453 and thereby ended the Christian Middle Ages. The Poles at the height of their

¹ We have adopted the spelling recommended by Arabic scholars as nearest to the native form.

power, by that victory in 1682 by which King John Sobieski drove back the Green Banner from the walls of Vienna, saved Christian Europe: they won the latest Crusades' battle against the Crescent. (It is pleasing to recall how King John's granddaughter was brought by the four captains of the Irish Brigade to James as his bride, to be mother of Searlas og Mac Ríogh Sheumais.) So recently in history did the Green Banner of the Prophet overshadow our Christian civilization.

HOLD OVER ITS PEOPLE

Only as recently as the relief of Vienna—near the date of the Treaty of Limerick—has Islam been eclipsed and backward. That is but a short time-lag in the progress of nations. Before Sobieski's victory, Islam was actually "the superior in fighting power and fighting instruments" (Belloc), and even "potential conqueror of Europe." Anyone who can think historically will realize that a people so powerful in, say, 1700, and driven back then, but not crushed, may be powerful again in, say, 1950.

Islam, Mr. Belloc considers, actually has an advantage over its temporary conqueror. He remarks that Islam has maintained its creed, while large regions in Christendom have apostatized, and some even are not heretical but atheistic. The heresy has not been dissolved; it still sways two hundred million minds.

What is the reason for this strange, man-made religion's hold over

its people? Too easily we underestimate a religion that we in Christendom know chiefly in its fanatical phases. We are descended from those whose very life, institutions and freedom were threatened with destruction at the hands of those seeming madmen: those Saladins who wished "to purge the air of Christian breath" by cutting down every Christian prisoner who would not trample on the Cross, those Algerines who carried Irish children into slavery, those ancestors of Orangedom who beat their African drums about the beleaguered Christian city of Valencia. To us "Mahomet" is a nursery word of terror, and "Allah il Allah!" a slogan of dread.

We cannot easily imagine Islam from within. The Prophet himself was a horrid person; but men of high character have been among his followers. The Moslem who does not descend from renegade Christians, but from heathen who were converted direct to Islam, is something higher than his fathers. He receives from his teachers belief in one Divine Ruler, in the creaturehood of man, and in the moral responsibility of man's immortal soul. By that belief, although it is but a truncated part of Christianity, he is raised above both his pagan forebears and the after-pagans of Europe. He is, for example, by far the superior of the unbelievers of the school of Shaw Wells and Joad. He has that which answers the soul's desire for a purpose and a moral order; he has dignity; he can rise to a great poetic culture; Is-

lam, with all its faults, is never vulgar.

This God-consciousness, however imperfect, does produce a strong and grave character. The spell of Islam has been described by innumerable travellers in the East. The poetry of its greetings comes to us in a hundred stories. We perceive the power of this majestic daily ritual over the multitude. "There is but one God, the Merciful, the Compassionate"—and all Islam turns as one man towards Mecca.

Islamic spirituality, based on this simple but incomplete worship, goes no higher than cultivation of a strong character on a natural plane. How should it go farther, when it rejects the final revelation of God, and sacramental unity with Him? The "true Believer," therefore, may be exemplary in the pursuit of natural qualities. He is truthful, hospitable and brave: but he is absorbed in the world. Like Communism, with which it has so much in common, Islam binds each to all and all to each, in worldly welfare. Like Communism, it rejects all distinctions of race and class and color. All souls are equal, not only before God (as Islam learnt from Christianity), but before Islam—that is, if they accept the Prophet. The Caliph and the barber, the Sultan and the shoemaker, are on one social plane. The lowest may aspire to the highest place, and the highest may pretend to no innate superiority. This insistence on equality has a spell that makes fanatics, in men who have been oppressed by ascendencies, castes and foreign conquerors.

Absorbed in the world, Islam has achieved many notable material things. It has excelled in medicine, mathematics, astronomy; it once led in sanitation, gardening and even domestic architecture. Yet we must note that its high achievements were in Spain, where it drew on the talents of subject Christians and Jews. Perhaps, it would be just to say that it was mainly parasitic: that it showed no originality, but skilfully drew forth the faculties of its betters.

In one respect, it always was a degraded creed. That was in its debasement of womanhood, which began with the Prophet himself. Christianity exalted womanhood; wherever devotion to the Mother of God went, chastity was honored, and the family and home were sacred. Where Islam went, a primitive pride of kinship might be cultivated, but there was no gracious home life, no sweet bond of the family. Only in neo-Islam has the emancipation of womanhood begun, an admission of Christian superiority.

The revival now stirring throughout the Muhammadan world would be a dire portent, if Islam still were capable of its old fanatic zeal. A Power of 200,000,000 people, living contiguously in the richest part of the globe and armed (as these lands soon must be) with modern knowledge and mechanics, would be a terrific force with which the war-weakened Christian or ex-Christian nations would have to reckon in terms of the Crusades. Will this come to pass?

One thinks not. The revival of Islam has two phases. One is purely national, and to that extent unorthodox. The Arab peoples who have won freedom from the Turks, Persia and Afghanistan which have grown patriotically self-conscious, Egypt which became a nation once again through such travail—these are animated by nationalism, and would seek freedom and advancement whatever their religion, or if, like infidel Turkey, they acknowledged no religion at all.

INTELLECTUAL MOVEMENT

Simultaneously, however, there is the spiritual revival, which goes on in the ancient centers of Islamic life, and notably in Cairo, where a great university is reconstructing the Islamic tradition. This intellectual movement is actuated by the spell of Arabic poetry and all else that comes from the past. One cannot speak of pride of race, where race is not acknowledged; but the phenomenon is exactly what we know in the West, when a Wagner mightily wakes the racial memories. Those intellects of Cairo, we may be sure, have no superstitious belief in the Koran, that was from all eternity in Allah's mind till Muhammad wrote it down; they are not vexed by the textual feuds which split orthodox Islam into "the two and seventy warring sects," and they reject the barbaric features of Islamic practice. They would restore the culture, and would

modernize Islam as an unsupernatural religion, reduced in dogma to two truths: God and Immortality.

Will neo-Islam, this religion reduced to a philosophy, retain its hold over the rising Islamic peoples and make them one in the future as in the past? Will the Arabian Scriptures hold this motley mass as once the fiery zeal of proselytism held their fathers? It may be so. In the very month when the present war broke out, and peaceful enterprises everywhere were broken, there was to be an Oriental exposition at Cairo, to mark the millenary of El-Kahira, "the Victorious." A daily newspaper in Dublin, when the fair was announced two years earlier, commented:

Who would not wish to time his eastern travels with this vast gathering of Copts, Arabs, Nubians, Moors, Jews, and other ancient races, displaying in their features and attire, in their tapestries and silks and golden-threaded robes, their carpets and curtains, and their bronzes and vases, potteries, ivories, inlaid swords and mysterious manuscripts, a living image of that world to which the West for ever must look back as a chief spring of its religion, letters, culture, art and fiction.²

These peoples cannot come together, or such memories as those of Islam be evoked, without far-reaching consequences, such as the Arabic confederation that already is envisaged.

Yet it may be that Islam will come together, to cease to be Islam. Those keen and earnest minds among its leaders, who cling to God and Im-

² The *Irish Times*, October 1, 1937.

mortality, but needs must reject the Koranic superstitions, even as they reject Muhammad's debasement of their mothers and sisters—surely they must send their thoughts farther and probe the beginnings of their people's creed. Must they not discover that Islam, a man-made substitute for Christianity, is insufficient? Must they not wish for the larger knowledge of God, incarnate and revealed, assured and pure, which the Prophet approached and from which he departed?

In the 13th century, St. Francis of Assisi went to the East desiring to conquer Islam by no crusader's sword, but by the persuasion that is in the

perfect Christian love of souls. In the 16th century, St. Ignatius Loyola had a similar desire, made pilgrimage to Jerusalem, and hoped that his Company would be entrusted with the spiritual assault upon the heresy that stood over the Holy Places. Surely we may hope that the persecution which Christianity is enduring today for the love of God, will attract the better minds of Islam to range themselves with Christianity, seeing in it the sole true defender of the fundamental truths. Islam awaking—shall it not come to the fuller knowledge of God, the merciful, the compassionate?



Class War

There are deep cleavages in America which could lead to dangerous divisions. Even in time of war, we are painfully aware of the struggle between capital and labor, farm and city, government and some of its citizens. Three times during this war there have been major campaigns against organized labor. First, it was the strike question; then the forty-hour week; and finally, the problem of absenteeism. While these minor wars were being waged, sensible persons advised caution. Each time they pointed to production figures to show that these attacks were based on wild exaggerations. Eventually the attacks died down and we heard nothing more about them. But the damage they did was great.—*Rev. John F. Cronin, S.S., on the Catholic Hour, August 22, 1943.*

Christ—Model of Teachers

MOST REV. J. D. SIMONDS

THE Holy Sacrifice which we are offering in common today must be a very pleasing oblation to the Divine Majesty. It is offered in honor of the Holy Spirit to invoke the blessing of that August Divine Person on the work that is most dear to the Heart of Christ—namely, the religious instruction of the little ones of His flock. It is offered as a corporate act of sacrifice by a congregation of Religious, whose lives are dedicated to that important work of religion. Since Our Divine Lord said that when two or three of his disciples are gathered together in His Name He is in the midst of them, surely the gracious and benign presence of the Great Teacher must be intimately with this congregation today. For you are not merely gathered together in His Name, but you have met to seek His blessing as you rededicate your lives to the continuation of the work of religious teaching which He Himself began.

The commission to teach the truths of revelation was officially given by Christ to the Apostles, and through them to the Bishops of the Catholic Church. In fulfilling that Divine command, the Hierarchy has for centuries enlisted the help of a vast army of trained and consecrated teachers; of whom you form a significant section. You should be deeply conscious that

*This sermon was preached by the Coadjutor-Archbishop of Melbourne at a Votive Mass, January 29, 1943, inaugurating the scholastic year in his Archdiocese. Reprinted from the ADVOCATE**

by receiving from his Grace the Archbishop a commission to teach religion in this Archdiocese, you thereby enjoy a delegated share in the original commission given by Christ to His Apostles. Your work of teaching is thus endowed with an apostolic character and your important part in building up the Body of Christ becomes very closely associated with that of the Divine Head Himself.

The principal thought which I wish to emphasize today is the close relationship which you, as religious teachers, bear to the Personality of Jesus Christ, the Supreme Teacher. I have said that you are religious teachers, for, as you are well aware, there is a great difference between teachers of religion and religious teachers. You are far removed from every other teacher, for your lives are consecrated by the canonical vows of religion to a work that is wholly supernatural. However, the primary purpose of your religious profession is not to dedicate you to teaching; it is to enable you to conform yourselves more and more

* 143-151 a'Beckett St., Melbourne, C.I., Australia, Feb. 4, 1943.

the model of the Divine Teacher. Therefore, at the beginning of a new year of Catholic education I shall say nothing to you about the secular aspect of your work, but shall ask you to fix your gaze upon the Supreme Teacher Jesus Christ, and seek your inspiration from Him for the work of the coming year.

CHRIST, THE TEACHERS' LEADER

Our Lord Jesus Christ is not merely the supreme model and pattern of the Christian life, He is also the exemplary and efficient cause of our sanctification. By your daily meditation on the life of Our Divine Lord, you are aiming to saturate your lives with the spirit of the Divine Model, according to the injunction of the Holy Spirit: "Let this mind be in you which was also in Christ Jesus." In these days the masses of the people are being whipped up by the crude artifices of propaganda to entrust their destinies to various pseudo-redeemers. As men's minds become more and more steeped in the spirit of any hero who is worshipped, by a psychological law their admiration usually becomes translated into imitation of their hero. However, apart from the blind fanaticism of some deluded followers, the dictators' appeal to mankind remains colorless and uninspiring.

But Jesus Christ our Leader towers above all the self-appointed saviours, and the compelling beauty of His sacred Personality not merely inspires admiration and respect, but

warms the heart and affections of His followers as no man in history has ever been able to do. As you devoted religious teachers are about to begin a new period of personal service to Him, I exhort you to strengthen and vivify your enthusiastic loyalty to your great Leader and to the cause to which you are dedicated.

Your habit of prayerful meditation upon the Personality and Character of your Leader will continually reveal to you new features of His flawless moral character. Of course, the personality of Christ will not fit into the framework of human greatness. Its beauty becomes intelligible only when one acknowledges that Jesus Christ is the very God of all perfection, who appeared in our humanity to raise us up to brotherhood with Him as sons of God. But He is also truly man, and all the moral qualities which we so admire in human nature were found in Him in their highest perfection, so that His character possessed the most complete symmetry.

His ardent zeal is no less admirable than His wondrous calm and composure. He united a holy gravity with a sunny cheerfulness; a majestic greatness with deepest humility. He had an invincible hatred of sin, but He ever showed the tenderest love towards sinners. He combined the strictest justice for the interests of His Father with a compassionate sympathy for the weakness of human nature; an inflexible strength of character with a tenderness that is almost motherly. His public life

was filled with indefatigable labor but His mind preserved an unbroken union of inward contemplation with His Eternal Father.

If one were to ask what is the most striking individual characteristic of Christ, we must answer that there is none, for every individuality is based upon a certain oneness and lack of harmony. No genuinely human characteristic is wanting in His exalted Personality, but no one rises discordantly above the wonderful unity of His nature. This is indeed His individuality and uniqueness, and for centuries the charming personality of Jesus Christ has not merely won the esteem and admiration of millions, but it evokes the whole affection of our hearts and our highest and undying love.

CHRIST, THE SUPREME TEACHER

It was the compelling charm of the Personality of Christ that inspired your consecration to His service, and it must also be the inspiration of your work as teachers, for He is in a special manner the model and guide of all Catholic teachers. Although the ideas which He expounded to the simple peasants of Galilee were sublime and super-human, He brought them down to the intellectual level of His hearers by a wealth of simple and homely illustrations. Anyone who studies the method of this Master in the art of exposition will be struck by His marvelous power of creative description. Have you ever noticed how carefully

Our Lord avoids generic terms? Instead of "animals" He speaks of foxes and ravens and sparrows. Instead of "plants" He points to the mulberry trees, the fig trees and mustard seed. It was not His custom to speak of "money" but of pennies, and talents.

The illustrations for His moral teaching are always taken right from the treasury of the daily experiences of His hearers—the lilies of the fields that spread before them, the sparrows that twittered around them, the vineyards that covered the slopes beside them. And His incomparable parables! He so enriched them with masterly delineations of things that are simple and usually unnoticed that the effortless sublimity of those stories places them amongst the greatest things of human literature. The earnest student of the Gospels cannot fail to realize that Jesus Christ is the Supreme Teacher of all time, one who can speak to us of the most secret and divine thoughts with that natural ease and familiarity which is used by others when speaking of their personal experiences or their daily business.

You teachers who are called upon to continue Christ's work of imparting the knowledge of Divine things to little children must imitate the example of the Divine Teacher by trying to make your religious instructions living and real. Modern methods of pedagogy offer many useful and interesting suggestions for vitalizing the catechetical method of religious instruction. You should take full advantage of all these

aids, subst
the t
perso
spiri
more
tiona
comp
acute
the
pray
But
resol

aids, but in the end, there can be no substitute for the personal devotion of the teacher, whose consecrated life and personal love of Christ will reflect the spirit and the teaching of the Master more than the wisdom she imparts.

In our busy age in which educational ideals are sadly secularized and competition in secular learning is so acute, the worldly-wise would counsel the religious teacher to shorten her prayer that she may double her toil. But I feel quite confident that you will resolve this morning to resist that in-

sidious temptation of the enemy of souls. The work of education to which you have consecrated your lives is a supernatural one, and its first aim is to produce supernatural men and women. Therefore, you must renew your determination to take no lower model for your educational guidance than the Divine Teacher to Whom you have made your consecration as religious. May the Holy Spirit of God bless and guide the year's work which you are about to begin.



Purity

What, then, is the specific value, or valuable quality which the pure man, as such, envisages and wills? It is the splendor which attaches to everything indissolubly united with God, the Holy of Holies, and preeminently to that which reflects the light of holiness which the pure man beholds, on which his gaze is fixed unswervingly. The brightness of His countenance to Whom the angels chant their Trisagion, which is, indeed, incompatible with any negative value, that is, with anything evil, but stands in clear opposition to particular evils, is apprehended by the pure in its clear, resplendent and immaculate beauty, and willed by an unreserved surrender. It is the surrender to this splendor which formally constitutes purity.—*Dietrich von Hildebrand, IN DEFENSE OF PURITY, Sheed and Ward.*

Holy Orders and Anglicans

REV. F. B. SEWARD

*Reprinted from the NEW ZEALAND TABLET**

IT is now more than three dozen years since the Feast of Candlemas on which, by receiving a blessed candle at the altar rail, I symbolized that I had just received the Light of Faith, of which it was a token. Hence I can look back at the days in which I wandered in the fog of Anglicanism with a certain detachment. The effects of error on the mind are like those of fog on the eyes; it hides reality, distorts truth and magnifies the unessential.

I have often been asked, since that time, by Catholics as well as by Anglicans, on what grounds the Catholic Church rejects the claim of Anglicans to possess a valid priesthood. Not of course that such a claim is made by all Anglicans; the "left wing," or ultra-Protestant Anglicans, vehemently deny any sacrificing priesthood among their clergy. However, the claim to a valid succession of Orders is being made more and more widely, not only by "Anglo-Catholics" and "High Church" Anglicans, but by those of a very "moderate" type. Some years ago a Low Church prelate, before conducting an ordination, announced that he expressly disclaimed any intention of ordaining sacrificing priests; this must have been most disconcerting to those of his *ordinandi* who believed in the priesthood and in the Doctrine of Intention.

It is difficult to summarize this subject within the limits of such an article as this, yet I think a brief historical introduction is essential.

Queen Elizabeth, as Hollis has shown, was far from being the "strong" ruler of tradition. She was utterly in the power of a group of plutocrats led by Cecil, though an illusion of independence was fostered by letting her have her own way in minor matters.

Under Mary, Cardinal Pole had reconciled the realm to the Holy See, and the Catholic Hierarchy had again been established. Cecil demanded, after the succession of Elizabeth, that all these Catholic Bishops should take the Oath of Royal Supremacy, affirming that the Sovereign, and not the Pope, was the head of the Church in England. The Hierarchy all refused save one Bishop, Kitchin of Llandaff. He was allowed to retain the revenues of his See, but at once retired from public life, and would not have any hand in the Government plan to set up a new Hierarchy. Of the other Catholic Bishops, those who did not succeed in escaping overseas were deprived of their Sees and imprisoned, and Cecil filled their places with Calvinists, or Lutherans, who had fled to Germany or Switzerland during the reign of Mary.

* P. O. Box 353, Dunedin, New Zealand, April 14, 1943.

Cecil was a politician, but no theologian, and thought it good policy to secure for the new State Bishops a status, which, he fondly hoped, would make their position "watertight" in the eyes of foreign Catholic States.

He understood that Catholic Canon Law had required that a Bishop should be consecrated either by an Archbishop or by three Bishops, and that to consecrate an Archbishop four prelates were required. He wrote to a friend: "There is no Archbishop, and no four Bishops, what is to be done?" His perplexity is responsible for the somewhat comic episode of Parker's consecration. The form used was plainly insufficient, consisting only of the words "Receive the Holy Ghost," without mention of the Order conferred. It was not amended till about a century later, when—whatever the merits of the new Form—the succession of Bishops had long been extinguished.

Cecil's object was to break with the old Catholic order, nor would the new State Bishops have submitted to a "Popish" consecration. Many of them objected to any form of episcopal consecration, as an empty superstition, and only submitted to it to please the Government, and to obtain the emoluments of their new rank. Not one of them had any belief in Apostolic Succession, as is clear from their writings.

The "consecrator" eventually selected by Cecil was Barlow, who had, while secretly heretical, been appointed a Bishop-elect under Henry VIII. He

did not believe in the need of any episcopal consecration, for in Henry's reign he had expressly stated that to make a Bishop there was no consecration needed, but only appointment. Most probably he was never consecrated at all, but sent on a mission to Scotland, and translated to another See on his return, to disguise the fact that he was still only a "Bishop-elect." He is known to have taken his seat in the house of Lords below prelates to whom, if consecrated, he would have been senior. That careful historian, Cardinal Gasquet, says of Barlow: "whose own consecration must ever remain doubtful." Msgr. Barnes has shown, by his researches at the Record Office, that in official documents drawn up by those in a position to know, Barlow is repeatedly referred to as "Bishop-elect" long after he was acting as a consecrated Bishop.

CECIL'S MISTAKE

Barlow was assisted in the rite of consecrating Parker as Archbishop by three prelates, two of whom had been consecrated by the Edwardine form, and the third, Hodgkins, who had been a Suffragan Bishop under Henry VIII. Had Cecil known a little more he would have made Hodgkins, the only validly consecrated Bishop of the four, the consecrator, and the other three his assistants, for Hodgkins had been consecrated under the old Catholic rite.

Cecil might also have known that two, or three, assistant consecrators are not required for validity, but merely

to avoid any risk of clandestine consecration. Some Anglican writers apparently imagine that this rule is to guard against any risk of an invalid consecration. All Catholic authorities are well aware that it could not do this, as the assistant only shares in the action of the consecrator, who is the principal agent, so that if he himself is not capable of acting validly, no number of assistant Bishops, however well-qualified, could make good the defect.

Once he had apparently overcome this hurdle of Parker's consecration as Archbishop, Cecil found the rest simple; Parker simply went ahead and "consecrated" as many Bishops as were wanted for the new State Hierarchy!

However, thoughtful Anglicans will admit that, to say the very least, this consecration, on which depended that of all the new Elizabethan Bishops, and consequently all subsequent Anglican Ordinations, was a very doubtful transaction. Barlow, the chief consecrator, was almost certainly never more than a Bishop-elect; two of his assistants had only received, by the Edwardine Ordinal, Orders which the Catholic Church has rejected owing to lack of sufficient Form, while the third assistant could only cooperate in what Barlow did; and if Barlow was no true Bishop, could not give validity to his act.

Yet in saying all this we have not yet touched upon the reasons given by the Catholic Church for rejecting Anglican Orders.

Even the State Government

seemed to think that some apology was needed, for, in Cardinal Gasquet's words: "Whatever invalidity there might have been was legally supplied by the Sovereign, in virtue of the plenitude of jurisdiction which was considered to reside in her."

In considering these doubts as to the Minister of Consecration, we must remember that the Government officials knew and cared little about theology and that the consecrators themselves did not hold either the Catholic belief in the Sacrament of Holy Orders or in Apostolic Succession.

In the Bull of Pope Leo XIII, *Apostolicae Curae*, the Catholic Church rejected the validity of Anglican Ordinations, not on the ground of the more than dubious status of Barlow and his assistants, but on the grounds of lack of sufficient Form, and lack of right intention shown in the Ordinal of 1559.

Regarding "Form," Anglicans have defended their Ordinal as "Scriptural," but it is hard to see on what grounds. The only form of Ordination in the New Testament is that employed at the Last Supper by Our Blessed Lord, when, conferring the Priesthood, in its plenitude, on the Apostles, He said: "Do this for a commemoration of Me." These words were only suitable when used in conjunction with the first institution of the Sacrifice, and as they are now repeated as joined to the words of Consecration in the Sacrifice. To employ them as a form of Ordination would be to confuse Ordination

with the Consecration of the Elements, and in fact no Liturgy has ever so employed them. But if "Do This" was never so used, still less was the Form "Receive the Holy Ghost" considered sufficient. In Ordinals accepted by the Church as valid, the universal practice has been to express in words, either literally or symbolically, the Order being conferred. This was done in one of three ways: 1. by naming the Order, e.g. "Bishop"; 2. by naming the powers conferred, e.g., "Receive power to offer Sacrifice;" 3. by using symbolic expressions recognized as referring to the Order in question, e.g., "Levite" or "Deacon."

To say "Receive Ordination" is evidently invalid for lack of definition, as there would be nothing to show whether a Bishop, or, say a Sub-deacon, was being ordained. Still less would the words "Receive the Holy Ghost" if not followed by more definite terms suffice, as this might refer equally to the Sacrament of Confirmation.

THE ESSENTIAL FORM

Some Anglican writers, at this point, are accustomed to assert triumphantly—as if playing a trump card—that Rome has never settled what the essential Form of Holy Orders consists of. This is quite true, and it is also true that the Form may, and does, differ in different Rites, e.g. the Latin and the Greek Rites; so also does the Form of Confirmation. Yet the Church holds both the Latin and the Greek Forms as undoubtedly valid. Catholic

writers, though not all agreed as to what is the essential minimum needed for valid ordination of a priest, or consecration of a bishop, are yet most fully agreed that the Form used must be definite; and that is just where the Form in the Book of 1559, on which the Anglican Succession depends, fails.

The Forms of Baptism and of the Eucharist are of course in a different category, having been expressly determined by Our Divine Lord Himself; in these Forms the Church has no authority to make any substantial alteration. But, in the case of certain Sacraments, such as Holy Orders and Confirmation, Our Lord is not recorded in the Gospels as having fixed any Form, but seems to have instituted the Sacrament in general terms, leaving it to the Church to determine the Form, and perhaps also the Matter, or even to make changes in either, or in both, from time to time. But Catholics are agreed that such powers could only be exercised by the Supreme Authority in the Church, not by local Bishops or groups of Bishops.

Anglicans often lightly assume that a "local Church" (whatever that may be—the phrase is often used for a single diocese only), has the power, not only to alter liturgical ceremonies, but even, so long as essentials are retained, to change Sacramental Forms. Even if this were granted, which is not the case, it has been shown that the Ordinal of 1559 did not retain what the Church has always regarded as essential for validity.

The new Ordinal of 1559 was drawn up rather by authority of the State than by the Church. Not only was the sanction of the Holy See lacking, but the whole proceeding was an act of rebellion against that See. Not only was the whole Rite changed radically, but the Form of Ordination was altered to something quite new and unheard-of, without any authority from the Church (to say nothing of the Matter). Had the new Form been entirely clear and suitable, it would probably have been invalid, according to common teaching, from lack of proper authorization by the supreme authority of the Church. At the best it could only have been doubtful, and doubtful Orders cannot be lawfully used, owing to risk of invalid ministrations, until they have been repeated "sub conditione." In fact the new Form was not clear, but was quite certainly invalid owing to its indefinite nature.

WHAT CARDINAL POLE DID

Cardinal Pole, in reconciling England to the Holy See, did the only thing possible. Acting under instructions from Rome, he merely inquired who had been ordained *in forma Ecclesiae* (i.e. according to the old Latin Pontifical) and others who submitted from among the Clergy he had ordained—not "sub conditione"—but absolutely.

Hence Leo XIII in *Apostolicae Curae* made no change in Rome's previous decision, he merely made fuller inquiry into the facts, and reaffirmed

the previous decision by which Cardinal Pole had been guided—namely that any Orders attempted under the Edwardine Ordinal were null and void, first on account of insufficient Form, and secondly on account of defective Intention.

The Intention with which a rite is used is always presumed to be that of those who issued, or authorized, the rite, unless there is proof that some contrary intention was externally manifested. This is simply common sense; one who uses a Form does so with the purpose of doing what that Form is meant to do. If not, he will normally make some protestation, as e.g. a man taking an oath, but protesting that he does not mean to bind himself. The case of a man who will secretly invalidate a Form is so rare, that unless some positive motive appears, it can be neglected. Hence the important point, in the present case, is not what Barlow meant to do when he used the new Ordinal, but what the compilers of that Ordinal meant that he should do. What kind of clergymen did the compilers of the new Ordinal want to produce? Remember that these men were not "Anglo-Catholics," nor were they even "High" or "Broad" Churchmen. They were quite undisguised Calvinists and Lutherans of a very pronounced and aggressive type. That is plain history.

It is true that the Sacraments can be validly administered by those who do not believe in them, as in the case of Talleyrand—himself an unbeliever,

yet a
crati
But
rand
and
he h
any
was
is pr
ishe
draw
noth
inter
their
Men
mitte
Book
and
whic
Hen
Cran
Ord
Cran
Real
not
in t
rally
men
be i
fied
and
deni
expt
prie
cesse
they
vers

yet a duly consecrated Bishop—consecrating the "Constitutional" Bishops. But this case is very different. Talleyrand used the *Pontificale Romanum*, and followed the full Catholic Rite; he had no motive for wishing to do any thing other than what that Rite was meant to do. Hence his intention is presumed to have been sufficient.

But the "reformers" had abolished the Rite of the *Pontificale* and drawn up a new Rite which was like nothing on earth; and in gauging their intention in so doing we must take their outlook into account.

Of Cranmer we read in Strype's *Memorials* (1,302), "Nothing was admitted into the Library (i.e. Prayer Book and Ordinal), without his leave, and nothing was rejected or impeded which he judged proper to insert." Hence we are fairly safe in taking Cranmer's views as those which the Ordinal was intended to embody. Cranmer expressed his disbelief in the Real Presence as follows: "Christ is not in the bread spiritually, (as He is in the man), nor in the bread corporally, (as He is in Heaven), but sacramentally only, (as a thing is said to be in the figure by which it is signified)." This is plain Zwinglianism, and with this denial goes necessarily denial of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, thus expressed by Cranmer: "All such priests as pretend to be Christ's successors in making a sacrifice for Him, they be His heinous and horrible adversaries."

Evidently he did not intend that

the new Ordinal should be the means of making sacrificing priests, (or "Mass Priests"). The revolutionary changes in the Ordinal show this same intent to abolish a sacrificing priesthood: all mention of Sacrifice is omitted, the bestowal of the Sacrificial Vestments is abolished, the Form "Receive power to offer sacrifice both for the living and the dead" is omitted, and so is the ceremony of the bestowal of the Instruments. Such changes as these, with the abolition of altars in favor of "tables," are pretty plain indications of the intention to abolish Sacrifice and Sacrificing Priests.

SUMMING UP

Moreover neither Cranmer nor the Elizabethan Bishops believed in the Apostolic Succession. Cranmer wrote:—"In the New Testament he that is appointed to be a Bishop needeth no consecration by the Scripture, for election or appointment is thereto sufficient." Parker, and at least one other Elizabethan prelate, are known to have held "ordinations" before they themselves were ever consecrated.

If space permitted, many extracts could be given from the writings of the Elizabethan prelates, showing that they assailed both the Mass, and the idea of a sacrificing priesthood, and no reasonable doubt remains that the new Ordinal of 1559 was intended to exclude both.

To sum up the reasons for rejecting the claim that Anglican Orders

are valid, and convey the powers of the Priesthood:

1. The new "Form" used for about a century, "Receive the Holy Ghost," is clearly too indefinite to confer genuine Orders;

2. The intention with which the

changes were made was to abolish Sacrifice and a true Sacrificing priesthood;

3. The chief consecrator of Parker, through whom all Anglican Orders were conveyed, was Barlow, who was almost certainly never consecrated.



Unity of Church

The Church guards its faith carefully, and believes it as though it had but one soul and one heart. It constantly preaches this faith, teaches it and passes it on, as if it had but one mouth. Although many different tongues are spoken through the world, the constancy of tradition is one and the same. The Church in Germany does not have a different creed nor a different tradition; neither does the Church in Spain, nor in France; nor in the East or Libya or Egypt. As the sun is the same all over the world, so does the light, the preaching of truth illumine all places and shine on all who wish to come to the knowledge of truth.—*St. Irenaeus, Adversus Haereses*, I, 19,2.



Vocations

No small part of the remedy for the lack of vocations lies in the hands of parents and school teachers. There is no question of depriving a boy of his freedom of choice of a path of life. But there is question of encouraging and helping a young man in whom the signs of a vocation to the priesthood are discerned. Many a priest acknowledges that, under God, he owes his acceptance of the call to religion to the kindly interest of his pastor, parents or teachers. In this, as in many other things of a spiritual nature, God makes use of instruments and secondary causes.—*The CATHOLIC RECORD, London, Canada, August 21, 1943.*

THE EDITORIAL MIND

Service Reversed

LONG ago, the American Bishops and our clergy warned that the time had come when our country, instead of being the field of action for the labors of priests from European countries, would become the source of the clergy for those very European countries that helped us out in former decades. This forecast is well on the way to realization. Already, this country is caring for the training of priests for many dioceses in Mexico, through the seminary at Montezuma, maintained through the generosity of American Catholics.

Another move in supplying a foreign country with priests has arisen. This is the training of priests in this country for service in Poland after its liberation. The American Bishops have made this generous gesture and offer, and now comes word of its enthusiastic acceptance by Cardinal Hlond, exiled prelate of that unfortunate country. Where, before the present world war, there were more than 2000 students for the priesthood in Poland, that country now has only seventy theological students, and all of its seminaries have been closed, confiscated or destroyed. The dire need for an institution to care for Polish students to

the priesthood is manifest, particularly in view of the deep uncertainty as to the fate of the Church in post-war Poland.

America will only be repaying its debt to Europe for the heritage of the Faith that it got from the clergy of Europe. This is a cause which we should support enthusiastically. — CATHOLIC ACTION OF THE SOUTH, *New Orleans, La., August 26, 1943.*

Rights of Minorities

THE war has brought home to all of us that the rights of minority groups are kept more sacredly in word than in deed. Even small nations suffer from their smallness when justice should be the same for all, great or small.

Since the social conscience of the world seems to have been deeply stirred and awakened by the tragedy of the war, there is a solid hope that peace will bring justice this time to small nations and small groups.

We assume with good reason that the United Nations are now driving on to victory. That means undoubtedly that the wrongs inflicted by the Axis powers on racial groups in Europe and Africa will be righted. But it must mean more than that. We must face

all the facts while the fighting continues. If Germany has enslaved nations, certainly they must be set free. If any of the United Nations have enslaved states, must they not as certainly be set free? Poland is a case in point. Both belligerents have occupied part of her sacred soil. Yet all of Poland is entitled to freedom if victory for democracy means anything. Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia likewise must be freed.

Going further into the question we find minority groups right here in the United States against whom discrimination is practised. This point is highlighted by a crisis fast approaching in our public schools. A shortage of teachers is threatening the closing of many schools. The shortage is acute in Maine, Georgia and Kansas and is spreading. The teachers are leaving for war jobs where they are better paid. Some, too, have been called to the colors.

In our parochial school system most of the teachers are priests and Religious. They are not deserting our schools. They are not seeking higher wages elsewhere. But this situation brings home to us the inequalities that minority groups suffer right here in America.

We Catholics are in a minority. We pay our taxes with all other citizens to maintain schools. But since many of us are not free in conscience to use these schools, we must tax ourselves a second time to provide the schools our children may attend.

In Canada and England the taxpayers' money supports the schools that the taxpayers use. That is democracy. That is justice. What about a little of this democracy and justice in America when this war for the salvation of democracy is over?—CATHOLIC CHRONICLE, *Toledo, Ohio, August 27, 1943.*

Purity and Babies

“THE revolt of British women against motherhood” was the subject of a seven hour debate in the House of Commons recently. Party lines were forgotten as parliamentarians expressed alarm over the falling birth rate. It is interesting to note some of the causes advanced: poverty, insecurity, bad housing, fear of recurrent wars, uncontrolled sale of contraceptives, the decline of moral standards, concentration of women on careers and maternal mortality.

Decline of moral standards is, of course, the root of all these causes, and yet it is the one for which no solution was advanced. The closest approach to the moral issue came in the suggestions of Conservative Francis Freemantle, a physician and public health expert, who said he was “alarmed and horrified” at the extent of sexual promiscuity, and blamed contraceptives for “much of the unwanted sterility.” “I believe,” he continued, “the strongest moral law to lay down to the population is that every boy and girl should learn a girl’s virginity is her ace of trumps.”

The tone of the suggestion would indicate that Dr. Freemantle is proposing some sort of propaganda campaign to make virginity desirable, perhaps an advertising campaign patterned on the cosmetics technique. Purity, of course, is a boy's and a girl's most prized possession, but it will not be maintained through natural motives. Nor will the selfishness of birth control be overcome by a patriotic appeal. The only effective safeguard of virginity and purity and the only cure for selfishness are the motives offered by religion, love of God and fear of eternal damnation.—*The AVE MARIA, Notre Dame, Ind., July 31, 1943.*

Government of Occupied Lands

BECAUSE the religion of practically all the Italian people is Catholicism, the Knights of Columbus, at their recent Cleveland Convention, requested our Government to take this fact into consideration in the selection of the personnel to administer the civil affairs of that country under Allied military occupation.

In a formal resolution, stress is laid on the need of choosing persons—especially if of Italian descent—who are sympathetic with the people's religious traditions and not too partial to any of the native factional or political groups.

The suggestion is opportune and well founded. With the avowed and flaunted aims of the Allied Nations,

to assure freedom and to protect the rights of oppressed people, it would be poor policy to allow a careless choice of personnel to put the lie to our aims and bring failure to the administration of the civil order in vanquished areas.

Nothing stirs the resentment of a people, and sets the machinery of ill-will into motion, more readily than offending their religious sensibilities. The bulk of the Italian people are Catholic and their traditions, customs and culture are steeped in the Faith. It would be sheer foolhardiness to permit a spirit of hostility toward these traditions to emanate from the offices of the Allied Administration.

The Knights of Columbus are not seeing a bogey-man in the dark in this valuable suggestion to our Government. Before the war, their Order had many years of experience in welfare work among the people of Italy. They had opportunity to witness the dissension, ill-will and distrust which can be aroused by anti-Catholic and anti-clerical elements in the midst of a religious people.

The case history of our State Department, in regard to the religion and culture of other peoples, has not been too enviable. The record shows that much of the suspicion which has surrounded the Pan-American movement and also the cooperation of Latin-American countries in the present war, has stemmed from our disregard of and often open antipathy to the religious beliefs and cultural traditions

of the South American peoples. Too often the urge to evangelize has been almost as active as the duty of accomplishing political objectives; with the result that our misguided representatives have done irreparable injury to our relations with these countries.

This war has demanded too much in blood and material costs to jeopardize its aftermath of benefit to all peoples, by a shortsighted policy in the administration of occupied territory.—*The EVANGELIST, Albany, N. Y., August 27, 1943.*

Bobola

As we write these lines, it is May 21, the feast of St. Andrew Bobola, S.J., who has come to be the national patron of Poland. The writer was present at Bobola's canonization ceremonies at Rome in 1938 and witnessed the transference of the relics from the Gesu to the Roman Termini station prior to their being taken back to Poland. Since his martyrdom in 1657 Bobola has been a symbol of Poland's stand along the Eastern borders of Christendom. There are some interesting prophecies linking Bobola's name and the national cause that need not be examined here. He was beatified in 1853 but canonized only fifteen months before the outbreak of this war. Among the letters pleading for his canonization was one from Marshal Pilsudski, written to Pope Benedict XV towards the end of the 1914-1918 war. Pilsudski attributed the lib-

eration of his country, "which appeared to ordinary human reckoning a thing impossible to obtain," to the intercession of Poland's patrons and especially "to that of the Blessed Andrew Bobola, to whom the entire nation has appealed and dedicated itself." As a measure of gratitude he begged the Pope to hasten the process of canonization, that this Polish martyr, "the patron of our Eastern Marches," may keep his people true to their ancient destiny as the bulwark of the Church against the dangers of the East.

Another letter, dated July 12, 1920, was sent by the town of Pinsk, where Bobola was working when he was seized and killed, and it testified to the confidence of the citizens in Bobola's protection. The letter declared that, though the town had been bombarded on more than ten occasions, not one of the townspeople had been killed. A joint letter of the Polish Hierarchy, written from Our Lady's shrine at Czestochowa, dates from two weeks later and repeated the plea for the canonization.

We must not allow ourselves to forget the sufferings and the heroism of the Polish people. They were this war's first victim and they have suffered, probably, more severely than any of the others. The war must end where it began—with the guarantee to the Poles that they can live for the future their own national and Christian life.—*The MONTH, London, May-June, 1943.*

T
place
nive
men
Aust
men
for
olic
chie
cour
gard
Eng
whic
1776

sure
tival
his
tion
mot
thou
our
the
moc
tion
littl
been
proc
the
dist
in r
of t
find
bur

Rural Revival in Australia

Reprinted from *The TRIBUNE**

THE convention of the Catholic Rural Movement, which took place last week, marked the fourth anniversary of a very remarkable development which has taken place in the Australia of our time. For this movement is far more than an organization for protecting the interests of Catholic farmers or farm-workers. It exists chiefly in order to promote in this country a way of life which was regarded as normal in the past, both in England, and in the United States which rebelled against England in 1776.

The tradition of the "mean and sure estate" of the yeoman farmer, cultivating his own soil and supporting his family mainly out of its production, has been almost destroyed in the mother-country, and is threatened, though still vigorous, in America. In our own land, which has grown up in the last period of the development of modern industrialism, the true conception of the land as a "way of life" is little known. Our farming has always been an affair mainly of specialized production for cash, either to supply the city or foreign markets; and the disturbances and changes of the latter in recent years have made the situation of the farmer a most unhappy one. He finds himself loaded with a terrible burden of debt and mortgage, while

the price of his products is too low to pay these charges, if, indeed, he can dispose of them at all.

This condition has induced a permanent "problem" state in rural life, and a rapid and steady decline in rural population. Finally, the drain of manpower for war, and the expansion of war-industries in the last few years, has brought about a veritable stampede from the country to the great cities.

The evil of this development from the Christian standpoint should be clear enough. The way of life of the country is socially saner than that of the city; it promotes healthy and fertile families, while its labors bring man close to the rhythm of nature, and enable him to develop varied human skills and crafts. The unnatural pace and conditions of industrial life, with its concentration of mechanized labor indoors, and its segmentation of life into a human and inhuman part—*leisure* and *work*—are bad for the body and spirit, producing abnormal emotional stresses and one-sided physical and mental development. Family life is broken up and becomes sterile; traditional religion and morality, which are linked with the family and community associations, become obliterated in the strange life of the city: a life of mass-contacts, which yet leave the human being isolated and helpless,

* 312 Lonsdale St., Melbourne, C.1, Australia.

without membership in any real human society of neighbors, with a corporate life and a true public opinion.

In all ages, in fact, it has been shown that the Big City—as compared with the small town and village—is a fountain of sterility and decay; and a nation whose life is totally absorbed by these conglomerations is doomed to perish. Its birthrate will grow less, its people unstable and incapable of conducting their social life in an orderly way; its culture and art will be an affair of dead imitation or living barbarism and ugliness. Can Australia be saved from this decline towards death, to which the concentrations of city life, and the desolation and debt darkening over the land seem to point the way?

THE FAMILY FARM

The Christian farmers of the Rural Movement believe that it can; that the foundation of a "New Order" of sane and human living can be made by spreading the "idea" of the family farm as a way of life, in place of the conception of farming as an industry in which the land is exploited for cash profit. They are working, first of all, to gain acceptance of their doctrine among the rural communities themselves, and to use the method of co-operation in realizing their plans, while fighting to gain relief from the burden of debt and excessive taxation which crushes the primary producer. They are concerned, too, with the study of the best modern scientific

methods for conducting the kind of farming which they consider desirable from the human standpoint, for they have no "romantic" hatred of machinery rightly used, and no desire to return to the drudgery of medieval peasant living.

One of the chief evils which the Rural Movement recognizes must be overcome on the land is a malady of the spirit—namely, a tendency to accept corrupt standards of value; to be ashamed of country simplicity and plainness, and to regard "progress" as equivalent to the urbanization of their domestic and community life. They want country men to stand by their own way of life, and to have their children educated so that they, too, will know and love the land, instead of despising it, and regarding the obtaining of a "good city post" as a social elevation.

Above all, they wish to see the life of the soil integrated with that of the Spirit, since it is only so that the roots of materialism can be plucked up which make man the helpless victim of the "economic process." They believe that the restoration of the land requires a long, uphill effort of work and sacrifice and joint action; and that if farmers are to restore their way of life, and reverse the tide of events which has tended to the destruction of the rural community, they must learn to understand the saying of Our Lord that "The life is more than the meat, and the body more than the raiment."

It depends, in a word, upon the

will
a sp
ing
hum
resp
chin
good
ers.
invo
choic
from
who
grad
enjo

will of man whether society is to be a spiritual organism aimed at producing the best and most virile kind of human being, capable of freedom and responsible creative action, or a machinery aimed at producing plenty of goods and services for servile consumers. And the aspiring freedom which involves toil and sweat and difficult choices, and is not mere "freedom from bother," will not appeal to men who look upon themselves as higher-grade animals, with great powers of enjoyment.

Those of the Movement have chosen the hard way of freedom; they believe that they can walk in it, with God's help, and can show their Australian fellow-countrymen that it is a way of life and true happiness. They entered upon their venture at a dark time, and have pursued it since under constantly-gathering difficulties; yet it has grown and developed. The work is being done, the numbers are increasing—the fire of zeal is not failing. The road may be long; but, with God's aid, they will reach the end.



Rural Life and the Family

The American Catholic family is dying out as to number and dying as to quality, because the typical American Catholic is an urban one. National groups, especially the Irish who settled in the larger cities, are disappearing numerically.

"Only two cities in the United States over 100,000 are reproducing themselves; they are San Antonio and Salt Lake City, and the Mexican and Mormons, respectively, are responsible for this biological strength. In Seattle the average number of children per family is eight-tenths of a child. The farther you get away from the land the more you lose reproductive strength. Consequently, any church that is strong in the city is in reality very weak.—Msgr. Ligutti at the Catholic Rural Life School, St. John's University, August 8, 1943.

Children's Story Hour

MARY LANIGAN HEALY

*Reprinted from the PRESERVATION OF THE FAITH**

STORY telling at our house is an all request program. It is not, however, an amateur performance. After a number of years experience, with a steadily increasing audience, I have become pretty adept at telling the right kind of story to the right little listeners. If that has the brash ring of a boast, you will have to forgive it, because I learned to tell children's stories the hard, hard way.

How happy I was when Mary Ann, my eldest, was old enough to cease wiggling long enough to hear a story. Ah! Another of those cherished experiences of parenthood. A story! Groping back into memory, I pulled out Red Riding Hood. It seemed as good a one to commence with as any other and especially for a child as devoted to her Grandma as this little pet.

A little girl in a red hood and cape, a covered basket of dainties for an ailing Grandma, a walk past streams of sparkling water and singing birds; that all sounded like a nice story. So far so good, but I didn't have sense enough to leave it there. Ah no. I had to dish up the old tale in all its violence wherein the big, bad wolf scares the life out of poor old sick Grandma, unsuspecting Red Riding Hood, and ends up in a pool of blood at the feet of the opportunely passing woodsman. Of course, you say. That's

how the story goes. What's wrong with that?

Quite a bit is wrong. I could watch my Mary Ann's blue eyes and know a lot was wrong with that story. Fright was there, horror and distaste, and even the slaying of the wolf could not erase the harm he had accomplished loping wickedly through the story. I knew that when Mary Ann awakened in the night, screaming, "The wolf, Mama! The wolf." And it was three years after that episode before it was safe to utter the word "wolf" in our house. That creature was carefully avoided in story form, and when he happened to intrude into adult conversation, he came out screened in spelling "w-o-l-f".

But we are talking about wolves again and, best of all, we are calling a wolf a wolf. Yet no one fears the word, nor cries in nocturnal terror at the images it brings up. We have a new story, in which the wolf is big and bad. And in the end he is overcome. But there is no woodsman with an axe in this story. Instead there is a gentle man called Saint Francis of Assisi who conquers the wolf by kindness. Yes, it is the wolf of Gubbio.

This one is the favorite of five-year-old Jim. "Tell us about the wolf of Gubbio," he asks.

"And about Saint Francis who

* Silver Spring, Md., February, 1943.

was so nice to him," puts in our Frances who is four.

Poised then on their little green chairs their Grandpa made for just that purpose, they await the well known tale, "Once upon a time there was a town called Gubbio." They love the sound of that name and have christened their favorite cat, The Kitty of Gubbio.

"And all the people were afraid," prompts Mary Ann in that manner in which children delight in participating in a narrative.

"Yes, the people were all afraid because there was a big wolf which frightened them,"

"But Francis was not afraid," declares a staunch voice.

"No." I agree, catering to the desire for repetition, "Francis was not afraid."

And so our story continued to the happy ending where the awful, terrible, ravaging wolf lay mildly at the sandaled feet of Francis, whose hand was stretched out to pat the tousled fur and whose voice called him "Brother."

Both of these stories have as their villains, big, bad wolves. In both stories it was right which was triumphant at the ending. But how different was the denouement. The woodman killed the animal in the classic of Red Riding Hood; Francis conquered with love in the tale of Gubbio. Which moral do you prefer for your offspring?

The lesson I learned from my

well meaning blunder in launching story telling with my Mary Ann has at least served the good purpose of shielding my other five children from a similar unhappy experience. In the present trend of youthful entertainment, this means a constant vigilance lest they be exposed to tales of a more harmful nature than the wily wolf in Grandma's bed.

OBJECTIONABLE RADIO PROGRAMS

For some strange reason, those who arrange children's programs on the radio, act on the premise that children revel in bloodshed and crime and disaster. On programs sponsored by products catering to youthful audiences, we hear rifle shots and machine guns (not military ones either), and rough, wild talk and the portrayal of crime and wickedness. The lone cowboy who rides uncontaminated through the world of vice, rides not alone. In his wake come the children with ears intent on each episode, traveling in touching distance of those forces of evil and wading in the swamps of sin in order to be there for each "come on" for the morrow. There are haunted houses inhabited by spirits with unworldly voices and supernatural powers, there are wily knaves and ruthless bullies. Like little sparrows fascinated by a snake, the children daily dial in to have themselves scared anew.

Among my friends who have youngsters ranging in age from six years to twelve (mostly boys), there are a number whose homes must keep

lights burning at night to dispel the imaginary shapes in the gloom which linger after the radio is silent. Nightmares are not uncommon and closet doors are avoided lest bodiless bones come rattling out, and a dark room is a pit of terror. The parents who see these things in their own homes shrug helplessly and say: "Aren't those programs awful. But they *will* listen to them."

Those same parents would not tolerate a similar situation in regard to reading matter. For some reason or other, the very tangibility of print on paper would be a substance to lay hold of. It would be a simpler act to snatch offending literature from young hands and to destroy it than to seek to sublimate the taste of those who pored over it. But the radio brazenly speaks what it pleases right into the family circle and gets away with murder. (And lots of it.)

COMICS ARE MENTAL POISON

The radio has an ally in the comics. Often Mothers are deceived by the innocent appearance of a book of comics and by the connotation of comics in her own mind out of her experience with the "funnies" in her generation. But comics today are not limited to humor. On the contrary they tend to give the reader "the works." Covering crime, adventure, fantasy, science, they skim precariously over borderline indecency. It is not safe to lure young minds to the brink of immorality. Probably the comics in book

form are the worst offenders in this manner, but not long ago I saw a strip in the most conservative Los Angeles daily in which the villain (a Japanese soldier) was pounding on a lady's bedroom door. No amount of rescue by our brave hero could at that point rescue the true victim—any child who had read and wondered.

But all of this is familiar to the American public. Particularly is it known to the Catholic public. It is some years now, since the Legion of Decency came into being and commenced the war against indecency on the screen and in print. Time and again, congregations of Catholic parishes have stood and taken the oath of allegiance to that organization in its vast and worthy undertaking. For awhile it seemed that those dark mushroom growths which had sprung from the black seeds of greed were to be exterminated and there was a noticeable improvement on the screen and a thinning of the pulps and cartoon periodicals from the news racks. At the present time, however, with such forces of violence and of disaster loosed throughout the world, there is a letting down of moral barriers which cannot help but find reflection in print and picture. This is the time for Catholic parents to be on constant guard. This is the time such things gain ground, difficult to reclaim, when the mind is elsewhere occupied.

It may seem that a discussion of suitable story material for the preschool child is more or less immaterial

1943
to th
the s
ica.
tinen
is de
wher
and
chara
have
ters.
and
and
plant
of r
prese
race
conce
larity
our l
he
prod
term
deed
men
I do
for l
one
their
to se
ably
one
hide
the
pers
men
ago
natio
whic

to the state of world conditions and the specific problems of young America. On the contrary it is most pertinent. Just as the structure of the body is determined by those formative years when the accent is on cod-liver oils and orange juice, so too is fixed the character to a great extent. And stories have a great deal to do with characters. Those complexes and fixations and phobias of which the psychologists and psychiatrists speak, are oftentimes planted by stories. How true that is of racial antipathy, wherein the first presentation to the child of another race so vividly affects his complete concept of it.

There are times when the popularity of a current vogue influences our better judgment. This was true in the case of the film "Snow White" produced a few years ago. The critics termed this a work of art, which indeed it was, but they further recommended it for juvenile consumption. I do not agree that it was a picture for little children to see. If you were one of those who took the critics at their word and trotted your juniors off to see "Snow White," you were probably deeply distressed when your little one began to shriek in horror as that hideous witch flapped away through the forbidding forest. In her, was the personification of all the "boogey men" on earth, whom you had long ago forbidden entrance into the imagination of your child.

There are evils in this world which wolves may represent and which

witches may portray, but there are other ways to acquaint a child with evil. I do not recommend soft pap for the growing, searching, eager mind. I do not think that we should avoid realism. On the contrary we should set ourselves to bring into story form the realest thing which life has to offer. Since stories are offered for entertainment but with the aim of fitting a child for his role in life, we cannot do better than to clarify that role in our minds and then turn all story material toward it. "We are born to know God, to love Him and to serve Him in this world and to be happy with Him forever in the next." Let that be the index to the story.

Now our stories are not going to be namby-pamby, sissy affairs. They are not going to be goody-goody nothings. On the other hand there lies ahead a boundless scope for stories. There is romance, color, adventure, glory and action. There are a great number of good books available bearing such stories. There are Catholic magazines, most of which carry a children's section. But best of all there are the stories you "make up" for your children.

I have found that my own children enjoy stories based on some incident in a saint's life or in our Lord's more than any other. Sometimes it is quite by chance that their attention is caught and held. What it was about the Wolf of Gubbio they liked so much I cannot say. I rather believe it was a combination of things. First of

all, the name "Frances" belongs to one of our twins and any story which carries any of their patrons has the personal appeal which attracts both adults and children. Then all children like animals in stories because all children like animals. And even the ring of "Gubbio" had a contribution to make to popularity. It is the same in other stories. In telling a sleepy child about the Guardian Angel which stands with outspread wings over his crib, we send the child to sleep, lulled and soothed with that enchanting picture and with a sense of enduring security, that in the darkness there remains that Angel to care for him.

Any mother will soon discover for herself just what her children want in stories. She will find it out in the same manner in which she discovered their tastes in food. And she will teach them to like her stories just as she did with food. The familiar foods were always readily accepted but the new and strange ones were taken gingerly on a pink tongue tip and sampled. But it wasn't long until new foods were accepted.

One day one of my boys picked up that recently issued pamphlet of the life of Saint Paul the Apostle by the Rev. Walter Sullivan, C.S.P. "Read us this, Mama," he asked. The pamphlet, excellent as it is, is aimed at an adult reading public, so I did not attempt to read the story but rather told small accounts of Saint Paul's travels. I had hit on a gold mine there! First of all, they all liked the idea of these

jaunts of Saint Paul, then they liked the exciting manner of his conversion and the proof he gives that bad people (or perhaps I should say misguided people) need not remain that way. And I will admit that the high point of appeal to my brood lay in the fact that "Timothy" entered the association with the Apostle at Lystra and that Timothy even had a "Grandmother" who was a convert, and our own Timothy Healy possessed the selfsame sort of "Grandma."

The story of Saint Agnes is one the girls like. The boys thrill to Stephen standing so bravely while huge stones were thrown his way. Saint Anthony is popular because of the many favors he has been called upon to perform.

Small children almost always think that "Mama" and "Daddy" are about the two brightest, most virtuous people on earth. In the due course of events they will find that Mama and Daddy are a pretty ordinary couple. However, if they come to know their Eternal Father, His Son and the Blessed Lady, they will have ideals which will never cease to shine. No matter how tall the children grow, nor how well educated they may be, The Blessed Lady will remain the Immaculate Mother of God, and her Son will be the God who died for them. And the stories about the dear Lord will be sad ones and horrible ones but they will all have a happy ending. And a happy ending is important to children. And to all of us.

The Spiritual Message of Ignatius of Antioch

AUGUSTINE KLAAS, S.J.

*Reprinted from REVIEW FOR RELIGIOUS**

POPE PIUS XII, in a stirring radio broadcast on Ascension Eve, 1942, bade us turn to the heroes of the primitive Church in order to "clear all mists from our minds" and to "put new life into our hearts" in the dark, threatening days through which we are passing. Most eloquently he describes these brave Christians of the first three centuries as "moral giants" and "athletes" of Christ, vigorous in both thought and action.

Such a moral giant and athlete of Christ was Ignatius, Bishop of Antioch in Syria, whose message comes to us clear and vibrant across nineteen centuries. It is something unique in Christian literature; it is the impassioned, spiritual message of a prisoner in chains impatiently hurrying to a martyr's death.

The historical facts of the life of Ignatius are very meager. He was probably a Syrian, born at Antioch. Neither the date of his birth nor the events of his early years are known with certainty. Legend has it that he was the little child whom Jesus singled out as an example of humility to the Apostles and then took into His arms (Mark ix:35). Most likely, as St. John Chrysostom asserts, he had seen the Apostles Peter and Paul, both of whom had dwelt for some time at An-

tioch, and had even been their disciple, since in the first century bishops were usually chosen from among the immediate disciples of the Apostles. Some think he was also a disciple of St. John the Evangelist. At all events, what is known for certain is that Ignatius was the third Bishop of Antioch, succeeding Evodius, who had been appointed by the first bishop of that city, the Apostle St. Peter himself.

During the reign of the Roman Emperor Trajan (98-117 A. D.), a short but violent persecution of the Christians broke out for some unknown reason, claiming Pope St. Clement at Rome and the aged St. Simeon, Bishop of Jerusalem, as illustrious victims. Perhaps the most distinguished martyr of this persecution, however, was Ignatius. He was arrested, tried and condemned to death at Antioch in the early months of 107 A. D. (according to the historian Eusebius), and was sent off to Rome to be executed.

The slow, wearisome journey through Asia Minor to Rome, Ignatius made with other condemned Christians, among whom, it seems, were Rufus and Zosimus. They were guarded by an escort of soldiers who were by no means pleasant travelling companions. Ignatius writes of them:

* St. Mary's College, St. Marys, Kans., July 15, 1943.

"From Syria to Rome I combat wild beasts, on land and sea, by night and day, chained to ten leopards—a company of soldiers, who in return for gifts only get worse" (Romans v, 1)¹.

In spite of this brutal treatment, their journey was like a triumphal march, greeted as they were on all sides by the Faithful of the places through which they passed. They made a halt at Philadelphia, another at Smyrna, where Ignatius was received by the bishop of that church, St. Polycarp, the future martyr, then a young man. Hither also came delegations of Christians from various churches in Asia Minor to salute Ignatius and to encourage him to persevere. The final stop was made at Troas, whence probably by way of Philippi and Dyrrachium they proceeded to Rome.

SPIRITUAL MESSAGE

During this protracted *via crucis* Ignatius wrote seven letters of varying length: four from Smyrna, to the churches of Ephesus, Magnesia, Tralles and Rome; three from Troas, to the churches of Philadelphia and Smyrna, and to Bishop Polycarp himself. These seven magnificent epistles, of undoubted authenticity, are "justly regarded as the most precious heirloom of Christian antiquity."²

Written in a vigorous Pauline style, the letters of Ignatius are filled

with warm, sincere, earnest exhortation, and packed with theological doctrine on the Trinity, the Incarnation and Redemption, the Eucharist, the Christian virtues, and the hierarchical nature of the Church. Indeed, chiefly on account of their unmistakable doctrine regarding the one, holy, apostolic, hierarchical Church, these letters have been bitterly, but vainly attacked by Protestants for over two hundred years. The following is a typical Christological passage: "There is one Physician, both corporeal and spiritual, born and unborn, God dwelling in flesh, true life in death, both of Mary and of God, first passible and then impassible, Jesus Christ our Lord" (Ephesians vii, 2).

In these letters the word "Eucharist," meaning the Blessed Sacrament, appears for the first time in Christian literature (Smyrnaeans vii, 1; viii, 1), as also the word "Catholic" applied to the Church of Christ (Smyrnaeans viii, 2). Cardinal Newman, a profound student of patristic lore, does not exaggerate when he declares that "almost the whole system of Catholic doctrine may be discovered at least in outline, not to say in parts filled up, in the course of them." They give Ignatius a just claim to the title of the greatest of the Apostolic Fathers.

What is Ignatius' spiritual message to us in these stormy times, so

¹ The quotations in this article are translated from the Greek text of Ignatius' Letters, critically edited by Father Xavier Funk in his *Patres Apostolici*, second edition, Tübingen, 1901.

² Bernard Otten, S.J., *A Manual of the History of Dogmas*, Vol. I, Herder, 1917, p. 65.

³ John Henry Newman, *Essays Critical and Historical*, Vol. I, Longmans, 1901, p. 255.

much like his own? What is that vital message of the early Church of the martyrs to which Pius XII so movingly calls our attention in his broadcast?

The spiritual message of Ignatius of Antioch can be summed up very simply: it is Jesus Christ. For this courageous bishop Jesus Christ is all in all. St. Paul preached closest union with Christ and St. John taught us life in Christ. Ignatius marvellously blends both these doctrines and inculcates them with extraordinary vigor. Christ is the ambient atmosphere in which Ignatius lives and moves; Christ is his interior obsession; Christ appears on every page, almost every line of his letters. I shall let Ignatius give us his message in his own words, as much as possible. It is true that he addressed it long ago to the clergy and Faithful of the churches of Asia Minor, but Pius XII says that he and his noble fellow-Christians are speaking to us today.

"Abundant greetings in Jesus Christ"—this is his usual salutation to the churches, expressed in various ways, sometimes twice and thrice over in the same letter. Jesus Christ is "our true life," "our inseparable life," "our unity of spirit," "our only Master," "our common hope." "For let us either fear the wrath to come or let us love the grace which is at hand, one of the two—provided only we be found in Christ Jesus unto true life. Let nothing be worthy of you apart from Him, in whom I carry about my chains, those spiritual pearls in which may it be given me to rise again through your

prayers, which I beg I may always share. . . ." (Ephesians xi, 1, 2).

And again, it is Jesus Christ "who also was really raised from the dead, His Father having raised Him up, as in like manner His Father shall raise up in Christ Jesus us who believe in Him, without whom we have no true life" (Trallians ix, 2). In every letter Ignatius gives himself a second name. It is always the same—Theophorus, "God-bearer"; and well might he have answered as the legendary 3rd-century Acts of Ignatius say he did when questioned about this name. "And who is Theophorus?" the Emperor asked, and Ignatius replied: "He who has Christ in his heart."

According to Ignatius, there are only two classes of persons on this earth: those who live in and for Christ, and those who reject and deny Him. To the first class, comprising the Faithful, he says: "You do all things in Jesus Christ" (Ephesians viii, 2). "You are, therefore, all fellow-travelers along the way, God-bearers, temple-bearers, Christ-bearers, bearers of holy things, arrayed from head to foot in the commandments of Jesus Christ. . . . And I am permitted to share your joy . . . because, on account of another life, you love nothing but God alone" (Ephesians ix, 2). "I know that you are not puffed up, for you have Jesus Christ in you" (Magnesians xii, 1).

On the other hand, those who reject Christ are living corpses. "Of what benefit is any one to me, if he

praise me, but blaspheme my Lord and do not admit that He was clothed in flesh? He who does not profess this has denied Him absolutely and is himself clothed with a corpse" (Smyrnaeans v, 2). But that is not all. "As for me, unless they speak of Jesus Christ, I hold them to be tombstones and sepulchres of the dead, whereon are inscribed only the names of men" (Philadelphians vi, 1).

Avoid, therefore, those who are not Christ's. "Flee from those evil offshoots bearing deadly fruit, which if a man eat he presently dies. For these are not the planting of the Father: for if they were, they would appear as branches of the Cross and their fruit would be incorruptible" (Trallians xi, 1, 2). "Abstain from noxious herbs, which Jesus Christ does not cultivate because they are not the Father's planting. . . . If any man walks in strange doctrine, he has no part in the Passion" (Philadelphians iii, 1, 3).

And be yourselves genuine Christians, stamped with the image of God. "It behooves us not only to be called Christians, but also to be Christians" (Magnesians iv, 1). "For just as there are two coinages, the one of God, the other of the world, and each has its own stamp impressed upon it, so unbelievers bear the stamp of this world, and believers the stamp of God the Father in love through Jesus Christ; and unless we willingly choose to die through Him in His Passion, his life is not in us" (Magnesians v, 2). "Wherefore, let us become His dis-

ciples, and let us learn to live like Christians. For whosoever is called by any name other than this is not of God. Get rid of the evil leaven which has become stale and sour, and be transformed into a new leaven, Jesus Christ. Be salted in Him, that none among you may be spoiled, since by your savor you shall be tested" (Magnesians x, 1, 2).

FAITH AND LOVE

Genuine Christians have faith and love, and these lead to deeds. "None of these things is unknown to you, if you have toward Jesus Christ perfect faith and love, which are the beginning and the end of life: the beginning, faith, and the end, love. And when the two coalesce in unity it is God, and all other noble things follow. No man professing faith, sins; nor does he who has love, hate. 'The tree is known by its fruit': likewise they who profess to be Christ's shall be recognized by their deeds" (Ephesians xiv, 1, 2).

And what are these deeds? "'Pray without ceasing' for other men also, that they may find God, for there is in them a hope of repentance. Accordingly, let them learn from you, at least through your deeds. Be meek when they are angry; be humble-minded when they speak proudly; oppose your prayers to their blasphemies; in the face of their errors remain firm in the faith; be gentle when they are cruel, and do not seek to retaliate. Let us be proved their brothers by our

forbearance, and let us try to imitate the Lord—who was ever more wronged, more despoiled, more despised than He?—that no growth of the devil be found in you, but that you may abide in all purity and sobriety in Jesus Christ, both in the flesh and in the spirit" (Ephesians x, 1-3). "Let us therefore do all things as though He were dwelling in us, that we may be His temples, and that He may be our God in us" (Ephesians xv, 3).

Hence, according to Ignatius, to be closely united to Christ, to live one's life in Christ, to be a *bona fide* Christian, means sinlessness, steadfast faith, strong love and Christ-like deeds. All this is fundamental. It is thus that one begins to be a "Christ-bearer." But Ignatius goes much further. He selects and emphasizes three particular means which will help greatly to "put on Christ" ever more and more. It is these three means that make Ignatius eminently a guide for us today.

UNITY IN CHRIST

The first important means stressed by Ignatius is unity in Christ, that is, union with the Bishop and other ecclesiastical authorities, and also union with one another. We are one or we are nothing: on no other point is Ignatius more repetitiously insistent.

He counsels the Magnesians, who at the time had a young bishop: "It becomes you not to presume upon the youth of your bishop, but, out of con-

sideration of the power of God the Father, to give him all respect, as I have learned that even the holy priests do not take advantage of his outwardly youthful appearance, but as men prudent in God they yield to him, yet not to him, but to the Father of Jesus Christ, to the bishop of all" (Magnesians iii, 1). And to the Ephesians he says that "it is clear that we must look upon the bishop as the Lord Himself" (Ephesians vi, 1).

The will of God, the will of Christ and the will of the Bishop are one and the same thing. "For this reason I took upon myself to counsel you to live according to the will of God. For Jesus Christ, our inseparable life, is the will of the Father, even as the Bishops, appointed throughout the world, are in accord with the will of Christ" (Ephesians iii, 2). "Therefore it is fitting that you should live in harmony with the will of the Bishop, as indeed you do. For your estimable priests, worthy of God, are attuned to the Bishop as the strings to a harp. Hence, by your concord and harmonious love Jesus Christ is being sung. Now join in this chorus, each of you, that being harmoniously in accord and receiving the key of God in unison, you may sing with one voice through Jesus Christ to the Father, that He may both hear you and recognize by your good deeds that you are members of His Son. It is then to your advantage to be in blameless unity, that you may have always a part in God" (Ephesians iv, 1, 2). "For as

many as belong to God and Jesus Christ . . . these are with the bishop" (Philadelphians iii, 2).

Not only must there be union with the Bishop but also with the priests and deacons. "Let all men likewise respect the deacons as Jesus Christ, even as they should respect the bishop as a type of the Father, and the priests as the council of God and the college of the Apostles. Without these, there is no Church" (Trallians iii, 1).

And the Faithful must be united to each other. "Work together, struggle together, run together, suffer together, rest together, rise up together as God's stewards, assistants and servants. Please Him for whom you fight, from whom you receive your pay; let none of you be found a deserter. Let your baptism remain as your weapons, your Faith as a helmet, your love as a spear, your patience as your panoply. . . . Be therefore long-suffering with one another in gentleness, as God is with you" (Polycarp vi, 1, 2). "Be then all in conformity with God and respect one another and let no man regard his neighbor according to the flesh, but love one another in Jesus Christ always. Let there be nothing in you which can divide you. . ." (Magnesians vi, 2). "In your common assemblies let there be one prayer, one supplication, one mind, one hope in love, in blameless joy, which is Jesus Christ, than whom there is nothing better" (Magnesians vii, 1).

If, living harmoniously with each

other, we must be closely united to the Bishop, the Bishop on his part must be united also to us, his flock, so that there may be perfect unity in Christ's mystical body. Ignatius gives excellent advice to the Bishop in a letter to his good young friend Polycarp, Bishop of Smyrna. "I exhort you in the grace with which you are clothed to press forward in your course and to exhort all men that they may be saved. Defend your office in all diligence of flesh and of spirit. Watch over unity, than which there is nothing better. Bear with all men, as the Lord also bears with you; suffer all men in love, as you indeed do. Be diligent in unremitting prayer; ask for wisdom greater than you have; stand guard, having a sleepless spirit. Speak to each according to the manner of God; bear the ills of all as a perfect athlete. Where there is more toil there is also much gain" (Polycarp i, 2, 3). "If you love good disciples, it is no credit to you; bring rather the more troublesome to subjection by your gentleness. Not all wounds are healed by the same plaster. . . . 'Be prudent as the serpent' in all things and always 'simple as the dove' . . . Be sober as God's athlete. The prize is immortality and eternal life" (Polycarp ii, 1-3).

Let not those who seem to be trustworthy, but teach strange doctrine, dismay you. Stand firm as an anvil which is smitten. It is a quality of great athletes to take punishment and to win. Especially must we endure all things for God, that He may also en-

dure us. Be more zealous than you are. Learn the opportune times for action. Await Him who is above time, eternal, invisible, who for our sakes became visible, who is intangible, impassible, who suffered for us and in every way endured for us" (Polycarp iii, 1, 2). "Let nothing be done without your consent and do nothing without God. . . ." (Polycarp iv, 1).

THE EUCHARIST AND UNITY

The unity in Christ so emphatically stressed by Ignatius is fostered greatly by participation in the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass and by partaking of the Eucharist, "a pledge of everlasting life in Jesus Christ." "Obey the bishop as Jesus Christ obeys His Father, and obey the priests as if they were the Apostles; respect the deacons as you do God's command. Without the bishop let no one do anything which concerns the Church. Let that be considered a lawful Eucharist which is celebrated by the bishop, or by one whom he appoints. Wherever the bishop appears, there let the people be, just as wherever Jesus Christ is, there is the Catholic Church. Without the bishop it is not lawful either to baptize or to hold an agape [a Eucharistic love-feast]; but whatever he approves that is also pleasing to God . . ." (Smyrnaeans viii, 1, 2).

Heretics, by disbelief in the Eucharist, disrupt unity. "They abstain from the Eucharist and from prayer because they do not acknowledge that the Eucharist is the flesh of our Savior

Jesus Christ, the flesh which suffered for our sins, the flesh which the Father in His goodness raised up again. Therefore those who gainsay the gift of God are perishing even as they wrangle; it were better for them to partake of the Eucharist, that they too might rise again" (Smyrnaeans vii, 1). "Endeavor then to celebrate one Eucharist, for there is one flesh of our Lord Jesus Christ and one chalice for union with His blood, one altar, just as there is one bishop with his priests and deacons, my fellow-servants. . ." (Philadelphians iv, 1).

Ignatius speaks of the Ephesians as "breaking one bread, which is the medicine of immortality, the antidote against death, a pledge of everlasting life in Jesus Christ" (Ephesians xx, 2). He himself longs for union with his Eucharistic Lord. "I take no pleasure in the corruptible food or the delights of this life. I desire the 'bread of God,' which is the flesh of Jesus Christ, 'who was of the seed of David,' and for drink I desire His blood, which is incorruptible love" (Romans vii, 3).

Union with Christ and life in Christ are achieved also by a third means, by imitating Him and modeling one's life on His. Since Ignatius' thoughts constantly revert to the painful death which is awaiting for him at the end of his present journey, he is preoccupied with imitating the sufferings and death of Christ. To shed one's blood in martyrdom he considers the closest imitation of Christ; it is

perfection itself. The only true disciple of Christ is he who gives his life for Him. Ignatius, shackled and condemned to death, now only begins to be a real disciple of his suffering Master and he will be a perfect disciple only through a bloody martyrdom. Let no one interfere to rob him of this prize, for whoever shares in Christ's sufferings and death will also participate in His glory.

"Honored with a name most pleasing to God, I laud the Churches in the chains which I bear, and I pray that in them there may be a union with the flesh and blood of Jesus Christ, who is our everlasting life, a union in faith and love, to which nothing is preferable, and above all a union with Jesus and the Father, in whom, if we endure the full onslaught of the prince of this world and go unscathed, we shall attain unto God" (Magnesians i, 2). "But if, as certain godless persons, that is, unbelievers, affirm, His suffering was only a semblance . . . , why am I a prisoner, and why do I even long to fight with the beasts? In that case, I die in vain; then indeed do I die concerning the Lord" (Trallians x, 1). "If these things were done by our Lord only in semblance, then I too am chained only in semblance. Why have I given myself up to death, to fire, to the sword, to wild beasts? Because to be near to the sword is to be near to God, and to be with wild beasts is to be with God, provided it be in the name of Jesus Christ. That I may suffer along with

Him, I endure all things, and He strengthens me who is the perfect Man" (Smyrnaeans iv, 2).

In the letter to the Romans we find passages on martyrdom which are sublime and immortal. Only a few can be cited here. Ignatius feared the Roman Christians would intercede for him with the government and thus deprive him of his martyr's crown. So he begged them to "grant me nothing more than that I may be immolated to God, while an altar is still ready; in order that forming a choir in charity you may sing to the Father in Christ Jesus, because God deigned to grant that the bishop of Syria be found at the setting of the sun, having summoned him from its rising. It is good to set from the world unto God, that I may rise unto Him (Romans ii, 2).

"I am writing to all the Churches and bid all men know that I die willingly for God, unless you should hinder me. I beseech you not to show me an unseasonable kindness. Let me be the food of wild beasts, through whom I can attain to God. I am God's wheat, and I am being ground by the teeth of wild beasts that I may be found Christ's pure bread. Rather entice the beasts that they may become my tomb and leave no trace of my body, so that when I have fallen asleep in death, I shall not be burdensome to anyone. Then shall I be truly a disciple of Christ when the world shall not even see my body. Beseech Christ for me that through these instruments I may become a holocaust to God. I do not

194.

com
They
they
men
I be
in H
ing
ever
1-3)

beas
that
for
me
who
Ever
I wi
favo
me.
May
me
the
cutti
bone
my
devi
vide
(Ro

the
me
in C
ends
died
sake
pain
me,
livin
give
be C

command you as did Peter and Paul. They were Apostles, I am a convict; they were free, I am to this very moment a slave. But if I suffer, then shall I be a freedman of Jesus Christ and in Him I shall rise free. I am learning now in my chains to extinguish every human desire" (Romans iv, 1-3).

"O that I may have joy in the beasts prepared for me, and I pray that they too may be found prompt for me; I will entice them to devour me quickly, so as not to be like those whom they did not touch through fear. Even if they themselves be unwilling, I will force them to it. Grant me this favor; I know what is expedient for me. Now do I begin to be a disciple. May naught visible or invisible envy me my attaining to Jesus Christ. Fire, the cross, combats with wild beasts, cuttings, manglings, wrenchings of bones, hacking of limbs, crushing of my whole body, cruel tortures of the devil, let them all come upon me, provided only I attain to Jesus Christ" (Romans v, 2, 3).

"The confines of the earth and the kingdoms of this world shall profit me nothing. It is better for me to die in Christ Jesus than to reign over the ends of the earth. I seek Him who died for us; I desire Him who for our sakes rose again from the dead. The pains of birth are upon me. Bear with me, brethren! Hinder me not from living, do not wish my death. Do not give to the world one who desires to be God's, nor seduce him with mate-

rial things. Allow me to receive the pure light; when I have arrived thither, then shall I be a man. Let me imitate the Passion of my God" (Romans vi, 1-3).

"The prince of this world wishes to tear me to pieces and to corrupt my mind towards God. Let none of you present help him; be rather on my side, that is, on God's. Do not speak of Jesus Christ and yet desire the world. Let no envy dwell among you. Even if I myself, when present, shall beseech you, do not obey me; rather follow this which I write to you. For I write to you in the midst of life, yet as one yearning for death. My human love is crucified and there is in me no fire of love for material things, but only 'living water' speaking and saying within me 'Come to the Father'" (Romans vii, 1, 2).

DEATH OF IGNATIUS

This urgent summons to the Father was soon to be realized. Arriving in Rome in the latter part of the same year 107, Ignatius heroically met the death he so ardently longed for, probably in the Colosseum. There are extant no authentic details of his final combat with the beasts, nor can the date of his death be determined with accuracy. Shortly after, his relics were taken back to Antioch and there they remained until 637 when they were removed to the church of St. Clement in Rome where they still rest. The universal Church celebrates his feast on February 1.

Ignatius was every inch a Bishop of the Holy Roman Catholic Church. Self-sacrificing in his devotion to duty, fearless in defending the Faith, untiringly solicitous for unity, ever an inspiring apostle by his personal holiness as well as by his words, he was one of the most profoundly Christian heroes of all times. As a true shepherd, he laid down his life for his flock. He carried out fully what he himself once wrote: "Teaching is good, if the teacher does what he says" (Ephesians xv, 1). He went even further, he sealed his message with his blood. Hence we accept that message, for it rings true. It teaches us union with Christ and life in Christ by means of

deep faith and an active love that overflows in good works, by close harmony with God's representatives in His Church and with our fellowmen, by participation in the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass and in the Eucharist, by the close imitation of Jesus Christ, especially in His Passion and Death.

The spirited message of Ignatius was often read at the gatherings of the faithful of the primitive Church; it gave comfort and inspiration to brave hearts in many a dark hour. It has not lost its appeal and significance today, for the message is Jesus Christ, who St. Paul says is "the same, yesterday and today, yes, and forever" (Hebrews xiii:8).



The Road to Dictatorship

Indifference to religion is the first result of secularism in education, and from this follow other effects that are detrimental to good order in the community. Without lawful authority in a state, there is either chaos or rule by force. But lawful authority depends for its maximum efficiency, not only on the will of the government, but also on the will of the governed. If the people do not recognize that all authority is from God, the Supreme Lord and Lawgiver, one of the very foundations of a Christian State is undermined. Then with natural logic the authority of the State itself is challenged, and the way is open to some form of dictatorship. A dissatisfied people transfer their allegiance from the settled regime to the rule of a party that deceives them by false promises and then binds them by iron laws worse than slavery.—THE CATHOLIC LEADER, *Brisbane, Australia, December 10, 1943.*

The Churching of Women

JOHN J. WALSH, D.D.

*Reprinted from the CATHOLIC TIMES**

"CAN I come and be churched to-morrow, Father, I want to go out shopping?" "I'd rather be churched now, Father, I'd feel funny if I put it off until Sunday."

Most priests have heard such and similar views expressed about what is popularly called "being churched." People have some weird ideas in their heads about churching. Most of them seem to believe that it means some kind of purification. Mothers have a hazy idea that child-birth brings on them a taint, which must be removed by their being churched. They think that until they are churched they must not go out and about their ordinary business. Some think that they may not receive the Sacraments before being churched. Most mothers believe that churching is obligatory. They think that they would be guilty of sin, if they neglected it.

Churching is not a ceremonial purification. The mother who brings her child into the world is not tainted by so doing. For a mother, child-birth is a privilege and a glory. A mother by conceiving and bearing a child, co-operates with God in the creation and preservation of one of His creatures, who can give Him glory, and love and serve Him in the world. She acquires true dignity: the dignity of motherhood.

There is no need whatever for a mother to isolate herself until her churching. The mere fact of becoming a mother does not put her in any sort of quarantine. If she wants to, there is nothing to prevent her going out visiting or shopping before her churching.

Possibly the phrase of "being churched" is responsible for some misunderstanding. It does seem to suggest that the mother is being brought back into the Church again. So people might conclude that child-birth put them temporarily outside the Church. Perhaps that is why some mothers believe that they cannot receive the Sacraments before their churching. But a mother is not cut off from the spiritual life of the Church because she brings a child into the world; nor is she deprived of her right to receive the Sacraments. So "being churched" does not mean being in any way reunited to the Church.

The churching of women means literally: the going to church of women after child-birth to thank God and to be blessed. It means that the Catholic mother, as soon as she is conveniently able, comes to the church to thank God for her safe delivery, and to obtain the special blessing reserved for women after child-birth. These ideas stand out clearly in the prayers and

* 33 Chancery Lane, London, W.C.2, England.

actions which conclude the ceremonial blessing:

Almighty, everlasting God, Who through the delivery of the Blessed Virgin Mary hast turned to joy the pains of the faithful at child-birth, look mercifully on Thy servant, who comes in gladness to Thy holy temple to return thanks, and grant that after this life, by the merits and intercession of the same Blessed Mary, she may prove worthy to attain with her offspring to the joys of everlasting happiness. Through Christ Our Lord. Amen.

Then the priest sprinkles her with holy water in the form of a cross, saying:

May the peace and blessing of God Almighty, Father, Son and Holy Ghost, descend upon thee, and remain for ever. Amen.

Churching is not obligatory. No Catholic mother is obliged to come to Church after child-birth to make a solemn act of thanksgiving and to receive the special blessing. If she omits to do this, she does not commit any sin.

Nevertheless churching is a very ancient and excellent Catholic custom. It would be a pity if Catholic mothers ceased to observe it just because they were not obliged to. They should give up their weird ideas about the custom

and be guided by the true notion of it: a pilgrimage to the church after child-birth to make a solemn act of thanksgiving, and to receive, through the priest, God's special blessing of them as mothers.

A Catholic mother will arrange for her churching to take place as soon after child-birth as she is able conveniently to come to church. She will come animated by a spirit of gratitude to God. While the ceremonial blessing is being given to her, she will be kneeling in the presence of Our Divine Lord on the altar. She will bring the light of faith to bear upon her motherhood. She will think it a privilege, a dignity, and at the same time a responsibility. She will thank Our Lord sincerely for having given her the privilege of co-operating with Him in the formation of a new, living creature. She will thank Him for having helped her to bear her child and to bring it safely into the world. She will beseech Him that, through the blessing she is receiving, He will give her light and strength to be a good Catholic mother, and to bring up her child according to His Divine Will.



Catholic Press

In vain will you build churches, found schools, give missions; all your efforts will be rendered futile unless you are able to wield that great weapon of offense and defense—the Catholic Press.—*Pope Pius XI.*

SOME THINGS OLD AND NEW

BAPTISM OF CONVERTS

Why is it always necessary that converts to the Catholic Religion must be baptized afresh before being received into the Church?

It is not always the case that converts to the Catholic Religion must be baptized. Converts are always conditionally baptized in the case where the validity of their baptism is doubtful. But in the case of converts from the Dissident Oriental Churches there is generally no conditional baptism at all. The convert in such an instance simply makes a declaration of belief in the Catholic Faith, and is immediately received into communion with the Catholic Church.

Of course when a convert has never been baptized at all the procedure is simple—he (or she) is baptized unconditionally. But there are numerous instances where the validity of the baptism of a convert is extremely doubtful. There was the case of a very high personage at whose baptism one cleric of his church poured the water and another cleric pronounced the words—and that does not constitute a valid baptism. So the Church has to take every precaution.

But baptism, even when performed by a non-Catholic or even by a non-Christian, with the right inten-

tion, of course, is held to be valid if the water is poured and the words properly pronounced by the same person. The Sacrament of Baptism can be conferred but once—it cannot be repeated. So if a convert from any one of the non-Catholic sects can prove to have been baptized with water and the proper form of words, then not even conditional baptism is administered. This form of conditional baptism is very simple. The priest says: "If you are not already baptized, I baptize you in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost."

Hence it is that when any convert is able to establish beyond all doubt the validity of his baptism, he simply makes the Profession of Faith and the abjuration of heresy, and is admitted into the fellowship of the One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church.

BOMBING

When was it that the Holy See associated itself with the Spanish Government in a recent condemnation of aerial bombardment during the present war?

So far as we can learn, the protest against aerial bombardment, which was put out by the Spanish Government, was made entirely on the initia-

tive of that Government. It is a fact that the Spanish Government, or one of its officials, let it be known to the world that the Holy See had put its support behind the appeal or protest of the Franco Government for the elimination of aerial warfare.

But, according to trustworthy Catholic sources, it appears that the Holy See was not associated in any way with the Spanish protest. And, as we understand, the Apostolic Nuncio to Spain let it be known in no unmeasured terms that the Holy See had nothing whatever to do with the Spanish statement.

However, do not get this wrong. Pope Pius XII has spoken out very strongly against the aerial bombardment of civilians and of undefended towns and cities. The point stressed by the Nuncio to Spain (and he did not mince his words) was that the Holy See is perfectly capable of giving utterance to its own pronouncements, which are inspired by spiritual and ethical motives. Furthermore, so the Nuncio is reported to have complained, the Holy See is not so inarticulate that it needs any secular government to speak in its behalf on moral or other questions.

The Holy See maintains cordial and even affectionate relations with the Spanish Government. At the same time the Holy See has its own channels of communication, and does not need to let the world have its voice on spiritual or moral questions funneled through the medium of any secular

Power. In this instance there is no evidence that Pius XII got the Spanish Government to act as a sort of sounding board for something which His Holiness is quite capable of saying himself—and certainly with much more attention being paid to what he has to say.

CATHOLICS IN JAPAN

What is the position of the Catholic Church in Japan? Has it been persecuted on account of the war?

No, there seems to be no evidence that the war has resulted in any persecution of the Catholic Church, as a Church, in Japan itself. Indeed, since Pearl Harbor, in 1942 to be exact, the Imperial Japanese Government asked for and received diplomatic relations with the Holy See.

The position as we see it is this. In a decree of April, 1941, which was certainly before Pearl Harbor, the Japanese Government, in accordance with the Law for Religious Bodies, issued letters of approval for each recognized religious body in the Empire. This, in fact, meant that the Catholic Church received official recognition from the Government.

After the decree had been published, the Bishops and Prefects Apostolic who held jurisdiction in Japan, convoked a plenary session at which it was decided they should resign in favor of Japanese Catholic clergy. For instance, the Jesuit Vicar Apostolic of Hiroshima, who was a foreigner, resigned his vicariate in favor of a na-

tive
was
poli
ways
shou
archy

tion
Chur
than
gove
Emp
bish
isten
amor
ante
infor
to th
Japa

to a
expl
urgy
Jews

Semi
In c
invi
a ra
tago
beca
sias.

Jews
away
they
Our

tive Japanese Jesuit. In all this there was nothing in contradiction with the policy of the Holy See, which has always desired that the various nations should have a clergy as well as a hierarchy of their own nationalities.

Accordingly, to the best information now available, the Catholic Church in Japan has benefited rather than lost by the new law; because the government of the Church within the Empire is now entrusted to Japanese bishops and clergy. The juridical existence of the Catholic Church amongst the Japanese was thus guaranteed by this law, and we have no information that the war has reacted to the disadvantage of the Church in Japan.

Jews and the Liturgy

The Catholic Church is opposed to anti-Semitism. How, then, do you explain away the reference in the liturgy of Good Friday to the "perfidious Jews"?

There is nothing remotely anti-Semitic in the Good Friday prayer. In other words, the Church does not invite us to pray against the Jews as a race (and anti-Semitism is racial antagonism), but rather to pray for them because of their rejection of the Messiah. The words of the prayer are:

Let us pray also for the perfidious Jews, that our Lord and God may take away the veil from their hearts, so that they themselves may know Jesus Christ Our Lord.

Then there follows a prayer that God may open the eyes of the Jewish people to the true light.

Now in all this there is nothing at all which casts opprobrium of any sort upon the Jews as a race. In short, it is a prayer that they may be converted, and anti-Semitism means the crushing of the Jewish people rather than their conversion. Read the story of the Passion in the Gospels, and see for yourself that the Jews in their time did reject the Divine Saviour. They cried out "Crucify him! Crucify him!" And they chose that Barabbas, a notorious bandit and gangster, should be released by Pilate, than that Jesus of Nazareth should be set free of the charge brought against Him by the Jewish High Priest and the Sanhedrin.

So it comes down to this: that the Jews either accepted the Son of David or they rejected him. But the Inspired Word of God tells us most distinctly that they rejected Him and delivered Him into the hands of the Roman governor-general to be crucified as a felon. Therefore, what can you say of them except that they were perfidious? Catholics and the Catholic Church do not despise the Jews as Jews. But it would be a perversion of history to deny that the Jewish people and their high priestly officials delivered Jesus Christ into the hands of the Roman conquerors, that He might be put to death for no other crime than declaring His Divinity. Well, that is just what the Good Friday prayer means.

WOMEN CHORISTERS

Is there any rule of the Church which forbids women to act as choristers in Catholic churches?

It seems pretty clear that women are not permitted to act as choristers in our churches, at least not as members of the liturgical choir—by which you may understand either a sanctuary choir or a choir in a gallery.

In his *Motu Proprio* on Sacred Music, issued on December 8, 1903, Pius X laid down this rule:

It follows that singers in church have a real liturgical office, and that therefore women, being incapable of exercising such office, cannot be permitted to form part of the choir. Wherever then it is desired to employ the acute (high) voices of sopranos or contraltos, these parts must be taken by boys, according to the most ancient usage of the Church.

Then again, on February 2, 1912, Cardinal Respighi, Cardinal Vicar of Rome, issued regulations for the whole Province of Rome, in which he said:

Women are forbidden to sing during the liturgical services except as members of the congregation. They may not sing in

galleries by themselves or as forming part of a choir.

And in a Regulation by the same Cardinal Vicar he said:

It is forbidden for women to sing in choir either alone or as part of the chorus. But they may sing at the church functions in so far as they are part of or represent the people.

Now this does not mean that women are forbidden entirely to act as choristers during the liturgical services. The ruling applies only to secular churches and cathedrals. The Holy See has made it clear that in the chapels and churches of nuns and other religious women, who have the obligation of chanting the Divine Office in choir, these solemn services are to be carried out by women according to the mind of the Church.

But all such choirs of women engaged in chanting the Divine Office and Conventual Mass are shut off from public view, and as their churches and chapels are, in fact, private, such choir nuns are not considered to be acting as choristers in a public church.

Wheat and Chaff

This seems to me to be the one principal reason why the good are chastised along with the wicked, when God is pleased to visit with temporal punishments the profligate members of a community. They are punished together, not because they have spent an equally corrupt life, but because the good as well as the wicked, though not equally with them, love this present life; while they ought to hold it cheap, that the wicked, being admonished and reformed by their example, might lay hold of life eternal.—*St. Augustine in DE CIVITATE DEI, I, 9.*